The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIV. *March, 1908.* *No. 3*

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—St. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonit, c. 6.*

Published by

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Washington, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS

BALTIMORE

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIV. *March, 1908.* *No. 3*

EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY QUESTION.*

i. The Fundamental Fact.

What gives rise to a University Question in Ireland is the fact, recognized by all, that there is at present in that country no fairly well equipped teaching body which Catholics trust with the higher education of their young men and women; that, in other words, rightly or wrongly, but from religious conviction, Catholic young laymen refuse to attend any school of anything like university rank, save one or two, which for lack of State endowment are inadequately equipped for purposes of university education.

There are in Ireland two universities: The University of Dublin, with one—Trinity—College; and the Royal University, with, as we may say, four colleges, one in each of the provinces; the Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Cork and Galway; and University College, Dublin—survival, as we may call it, of the Catholic University founded by Newman. There are, in addition, colleges for special professions: Maynooth and seven other Catholic ecclesiastical seminaries; the Catholic University School of Medicine and the Royal College of Surgeons; a Royal

* We publish this article out of its regular place in the series on *Education in Ireland* because of the interest which centers on the University Question during the present session of the British Parliament.—(Editor.)

College of Science, intended for higher technical instruction; a Veterinary College; a college for Presbyterians; and a few small colleges for the higher education of women.

As most of these special schools either are not intended for the education of laymen, or are languishing for lack of endowment and organic connection with a living university, we may leave them out of account as affecting the essential fact—that there is no fairly well equipped school of higher studies to which Catholics are willing to send their sons and daughters. The only State-endowed schools of university standing are Trinity College, the three Queen's Colleges, and University College; while for special studies there are St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, the College of Surgeons, the Catholic University School of Medicine, the College of Science, and the Veterinary College.

Trinity and the Queen's Colleges are shunned by Catholics on religious grounds; University College and the Catholic University School of Medicine are badly housed and equipped; the College of Surgeons is almost as bad as Trinity, Maynooth College is not for laymen. There is, therefore, at present in Ireland no fairly well equipped school of higher studies to which Catholic parents are willing to send their children. That is the fundamental fact which gives rise to a university question in Ireland.

There are other facts which, though subsidiary, are of sufficient importance to cause dissatisfaction, even though Trinity and the Queen's Colleges were made acceptable to Catholics. For, apart from considerations of religion, there are complaints of the way in which these institutions are managed; as well as that the trend and character of the teaching are not suited to the present most pressing needs of the Irish people. Under this aspect, however, the question does not present any great difficulty; it would be settled very quickly if only we could get over the difficulty of religion.

ii. Trinity College.

This establishment is situated in the very heart of the city of Dublin, on a site so large as to afford room not only for extensive buildings, but for spacious cricket, football, and tennis

grounds, as well as Fellows' gardens; besides which there is a large area, known as The Wilderness, planted at present with trees and shrubs. The buildings consist of a (Protestant Episcopalian) chapel, residences, halls, lecture-rooms, library, museums, laboratories, etc.; laid out, for the most part, in four quadrangles, with a magnificent frontage on College Green, the centre of the city. No university in Europe can boast of a finer position.

In the Report of a Royal Commission which, in 1906, inquired into the state of the College, I find its total income for the year ending 1905 set down as £92,985;[1] of which, as far as I can make out, about £48,000 was derived from State endowments, the remainder being made up of interest on private donations and students' fees. The State endowment consists (1) of landed estates in different counties of Ireland; (2) of ground rents in the city of Dublin; and (3) of mortgages, Bank of Ireland Stock, and other investments in commercial undertakings, principally railways. As a small portion of the capital invested in this way may have been derived from savings on the private endowments of the College, I am not in a position to state exactly the amount of income derived from State funds. The estimate given £48,000—will not, I think, be found to be wide of the mark.

Trinity College was founded by Queen Elizabeth as a strictly Protestant institution, and retained this character till the year 1873, when an Act of Parliament, known as Fawcett's Act, threw open to members of all denominations all offices in the College, with the exception of those held by professors and teachers in Divinity. Notwithstanding this change, it is a fact that nearly all the offices are held at present by non-Catholics—indeed by members of the only denomination to which they were open before the passing of Fawcett's Act. I shall have to return to this fact with a view to determine its cause; for the present I merely state it as a fact, which, however we may dispute about the cause, is itself indisputable. For the past thirty years there have been one or two Catholics, never more, on the staff at any one time.

[1] See *Appendix to Final Report*, p. 490.

The number of students in the College is at present about 1,000. In one Return [2] I find it given as 1,114 in January, 1906; in another [3] as 965 in July 1st of that year; and in a third [4] as 1,250 on May 1st of the same year. Of these 1,250 students 929 belonged to the (Protestant Episcopalian) Church of Ireland; 140 were Catholics; 88 Presbyterians; 33 Methodists; and there were 60 others.[5] For the six years from 1901 to 1906 the average number of students on the books was 1,002, of whom 251 resided within and 751 outside the College.[6] There were 69 women students on the 1st July, 1906.[7]

At the present time (Jan., 1908) it is permitted to students to obtain degrees at the University of Dublin by passing examinations only, without residence or attending lectures in Trinity College. It appears probable that about ten per cent. of the graduates obtain their degrees solely by examination, and that the number of such graduates is decreasing.[8]

As to the government of the College, it is sufficient for my purpose to say that it is vested, practically, in three bodies; the Board, the Council, and the Senate; that the Senate Board consists of the Provost and the seven most Senior of the Fellows, known as Senior Fellows; of the Doctors or Masters of the University; and the Council of the Provost and sixteen members elected out of the Senate, four by the Senior Fellows, four by the Junior Fellows, four by the Professors who are not Fellows, and four by those members of the Senate who are not entitled to vote as Fellows or Professors.[9] The Council so constituted "is empowered to nominate to all professorships, ex-

[2] *Appendix to First Report* of the Royal Commission on Trinity College, Dublin, and the University of Dublin (quoted in future as *Report of Commission on Trinity College*), p. 21.

[3] *Appendix to Final Report* of same, p. 337.

[4] *Ibid.*—"I called the attention of the Secretary [of the Commission] to the return you asked for as to the number of students on our books on the 1st July, and I pointed out to him that it would be better if the numbers were taken on the 1st May." (*Ibid.* Evidence of the Provost, p. 200.)

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 337.

[6] *Appendix to First Report*, p. 21. [7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Final Report* of Commission on Trinity College, n. 159.

[9] *Ibid.*, n. 69.

cept those the nomination to which is vested in some other body, and except certain professorships in the School of Divinity; but the nomination of the Council is subject to the approval of the Provost and Senior Fellows." [10] This applies to the appointment of Professors, Lecturers, etc., as distinguished from Fellows, whose election, as Fellows, depends on competitive examination. Besides the Provost there are seven Senior and 24 Junior Fellows; 69 Professors, Lecturers, or Assistants, who are not Fellows; and 24 other officials.[11]

In Trinity College there is a Faculty of Divinity, in which there are twelve Professors, Lecturers, or Assistants, whose emoluments amounted in 1905 to £3,186, almost all of which came from funds supplied by the State. The students in this Faculty have, of course, many other advantages, from libraries, museums, residences, grounds, lectures of professors in other Faculties [12] none of which would be available if the Faculty of Divinity were removed from the College, as it would have been long since were it not endowed with public funds. There is, besides, the Chapel, in which the service is that of the (Protestant Episcopalian) Church of Ireland. For the conduct of this service, in addition to what is paid to the Professors in the Faculty of Divinity, there is a sum of £357 shared by nine other officials.[13] Further, the Rev. Mr. Gray, one of the Senior Fellows, receives as Catechist an income of £150 a year. As showing the standing of the different denominations, I find two items of £32 and £16 paid to two Presbyterian Catechists in the same year, 1905.

[10] *Ibid.*, n. 70.

[11] A detailed list of the officials and their emoluments is given in the *Appendix to the First Report* of the Commission on Trinity College, pp. 11 ff.

[12] I find, for instance, that among the Junior Fellows there is a Professor of Hebrew, with two assistants, both Junior Fellows, all paid out of the State Endowment. There are moreover, professors and lecturers in Logics and Ethics, all plainly intended for the benefit, for the most part, of Divinity students; who have in addition the advantage of lectures in the Ancient Classics, Modern Languages, Mathematics, Physical Sciences, etc.; all of which in strictly denominational colleges have to be provided without any aid from the State.

[13] *Appendix to First Report* of the Commission, p. 19.

As Ireland is a poor country, in which, if education were costly, it would be beyond the reach of all but the comparatively few, it will be interesting to estimate the expense of taking a degree in Trinity College. From a Supplemental Statement [14] submitted by the Rev. T. T. Gray, one of the Senior Fellows, we learn that "the total cost (in fees) of the B. A. degree at present is £83.4.4, made up of an Entrance Fee of £15, eight half-yearly payments of £8.8.0, and £1 for the Degree and Testimonium." Accordingly, the first year costs in fees, £31.16.0; and the remaining three years £16.6.0 each. To this must be added the cost of living; which varies, of course, with the style. I do not know what it comes to for those who have rooms in the College; but I am aware that there are distinguished men who, when students of the Royal University, did not spend for board and lodging more than fifteen shillings a week. Let us put it at £1 a week, which those who know student life in Dublin will deem a fairly liberal allowance. For 36 weeks, which is about as much as is contained in an academic year, this comes to £36; or, with fees, to £52.16.0, for the first year, £67.16.0. To this, of course, must be added expenses of traveling, books, clothes, besides a modest share of pocket-money. By way of set-off, however, it must be remembered that there are numerous and valuable prizes; as also that for those whose family reside in the neighborhood of the University, the main item, for board and lodging, would not be felt so much; finally, that many very worthy men have contrived to pass their student days on little more than half the £1 a week which I have allowed for board and lodging.

I promised to return to the question why, notwithstanding Fawcett's Act, so few Catholics have succeeded in obtaining office in Trinity College for more than thirty years. Trinity men, of course, and Protestants in these countries, with but a few noble exceptions, ascribe this failure to the malign influence of the Catholic priesthood, who are afraid to allow those over whom they tyrannise to be enlightened. Catholics openly proclaim that it is due to the fact that Fawcett's Act, while doing away with formal tests, has had little or no effect on the almost

[14] Published in the *Appendix to Final Report*, p. 345.

equally effective test which is informal. That this is the true mind even of Protestants, is plain from the fact that it is mainly on this very score they object to the endowment of a University for Catholics, in which there would be no formal test whatever.[15] The Council of the Royal University Graduates Association put it very well when they say, as quoted in the note at the foot of this page, that "it is not the absence of tests but the constitution of the Governing Body which is important." Fawcett's Act left the Governing Body of Trinity College absolutely Protestant at the beginning of the new period; and there will never be fair play and genuine open competition till Catholics get representation on that body in proportion to the number of students they can send into the College. This implies, of course, that the Governing Body must be selected for a time on grounds other than academic; but, surely, the competition under which Fellows were selected since the passing of Fawcett's Act was free and open only in name; since, the Governing Body being entirely Protestant, Catholics could not be reasonably expected to enter the College and compete. The Present Governing Body, therefore, has not been selected from the best men in Ireland by competition which was truly free and open; this, as we shall see, has been implicitly admitted by those Fellows and Professors who proposed in 1906 to give Catholics, selected at first on non-academic grounds, one-fourth of the seats. In any case, it is only the very simple or the very prejudiced who pay much attention now to the poor kind of academic distinction that is gained, merely by passing an examination for Fellowship, by one who never afterwards did anything and can show no published work of acknowledged merit.

[15] This fact is too well known and too often repeated to need proof. At a meeting of the Council of the Royal University Graduates Association held at Belfast on Dec. 18, 1907, the following statement was unanimously adopted: "The Council renews its protest against the proposal to establish at the expense of the State a new sectarian College, and in view of what Mr. Birrell said in his speech in Belfast, desires to point out that the absence of tests is no proof that an institution is unsectarian. The Jesuit College in Dublin is free from tests. It is not the absence of tests but the constitution of the Governing Body which is important." (*The Daily Express*, Dublin, Dec. 20, 1907, p. 6.)

iii. The Royal University.

This institution may be said to have been founded in 1845, when three Colleges of university standing were established, one in each of the cities of Belfast, Cork and Galway. These Colleges, known as Queen's Colleges, were ready for the reception of students in the session of 1849-50, and were soon afterwards formally combined into what was called the Queen's University,[16] which was dissolved in 1879. At the time of its dissolution those who had taken degrees were allowed all the rights and privileges of graduates of the Royal University, which was founded in the same year, to take the place of the Queen's, but on a broader basis. Only those who matriculated and attended lectures in one of the three Queen's Colleges could graduate in the Queen's University; whereas the Royal confers degrees on mere examination, even though the preparation of the candidate should be altogether due to private study.

It must not be understood, however, that the Royal University is a mere examining board and not a teaching body. There are 29 fellowships, each worth £400 a year, which are held on condition that " if required, by the Senate, the holders shall give their services in teaching students of the University in some educational institution approved by the Senate, wherein matriculated students of the University are being taught." [17] Five such institutions have been approved, and the Fellows are required to teach therein, being distributed as follows: University College, Dublin, 15; Queen's College, Belfast, 7; Queen's College, Cork, 3; Queen's College, Galway, 3; Magee College, Londonderry, 1. The Royal University, accordingly, is a teaching body in so far as it commissions 29 Fellows to teach in recognized Colleges.[18]

[16] See the Memorandum of Dr. G. Johnstone Stoney, published in the *Appendix to the Second Report* of the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland (quoted in future as the Robertson Commission), p. 313.

[17] Fellowship Scheme embodied in the original Statutes of the University. See *Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 6.

[18] Since the graduates of the Royal University, who are Catholics for the most part, began to press on Trinity College, it has been the cue of

There are, moreover, 8 "Medical Fellows;" besides a large number of Examiners, and Assistant Examiners, who, though not bound by the terms of their appointment to teach in any institution, yet are practically all attached as Professors to some "approved" College. The Senate, which has the bestowal of these places, takes care that they are given only to such Professors, thereby securing higher remuneration, and, presumably, more competent teaching for the Colleges which receive this indirect endowment. It is pretty well recognized in Ireland, especially among the sharp student class, that one's chance of securing a pass, exhibition, scholarship, or other prize, in the Royal University, is considerably improved if one reads under the Professors who, as Fellows or Examiners, conduct and report on the examinations. The natural result is a tendency to attend the lectures provided in this way by the University and not to depend on private study, extern teaching, or what is called "grinding." [19]

the supporters of the latter to insist that the Royal University is but an examining body. For the same reason the Protestants have been denouncing the Intermediate Examinations as being tests of mere "cram"—their own candidates having been well beaten.

[19] The subjoined Table, taken from the *Appendix to the First Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 284, gives the percentage of students who passed the various examinations in Arts after preparation by private study or private tuition. This does not mean that the remainder studied in one of the five "approved" Colleges; but only that their names were entered as having studied either in these or in some of the smaller Colleges of something like university standing:

MALE STUDENTS.

	Total Number of Students for the 3 years, 1898–1900.	Number of those who studied privately or under private tuition during same period.	Proportion per cent., for the period 1898-1900, who studied privately.
MATRICULATION :—			
Passed, ...	1568	226	14.41
Passed with Honours, . .	158	11	6.96
Gained 2nd Class Exhibition,	49	2	4.08
Gained 1st Class Exhibition,	26	2	7.69
FIRST UNIVERSITY :—			
Passed, ...	858	208	24.24
Passed with Honours, . .	86	7	8.13
Gained 2nd Class Exhibition,	33	2	6.06
Gained 1st Class Exhibition,	27	2	7.40

The Fellows and Examiners of the Royal University, as has been said, are all appointed by the Senate, which is itself appointed by Dublin Castle—the British Government. In the original Statutes it was provided "that in course of time the fellowships of the University should be thrown open to competition among the graduates"; but as this, if carried into effect, "would have made the system of indirect endowment impracticable, the Statutes were amended in 1888, and this regulation omitted. The Senate has, accordingly, continued to the present time to appoint Fellows, by open voting without competitive examination.[20]

As there is no formal test, religion is supposed not to be taken into account in making any of these appointments; the religious test, however, is very real, not only as regards appointment to fellowships and examinerships, but as regards the retention of those offices. The Senate, in the first place, is half Catholic and half Protestant; this though Protestants have complete control of Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges—the only other State-endowed establishments of university standing. The half-and-half Senate takes care that the fellowships and examinerships are given half-and-half. As Examiners are appointed but for one year, you may imagine how severe the religious test is

SECOND UNIVERSITY:—			
Passed, ...	470	118	25.10
Passed with Honours, . .	88	10	11.36
Gained 2nd Class Exhibition,	26	1	3.84
Gained 1st Class Exhibition,	12	—	—
B. A.:—			
Passed, ...	300	69	23.
Passed with Honours, . .	77	12	15.58
Gained 2nd Class Exhibition,	30	7	23.33
Gained 1st Class Exhibition,	17	1	5.88
M. A.:—			
Passed, ...	37	7	18.91
Passed with Honours, . .	21	3	14.28

Note the decrease in the percentage of those who passed with honours and secured prizes. The women who studied privately make even a worse show; but then many of those who did not study privately, though they were not allowed to attend lectures in the approved Colleges, had the advantage of being taught by the Fellows and Examiners in other institutions.

[20] *Final Report* of Robertson Commission, p. 6.

for those positions. Nor is it less severe for the office of Fellow, the holders of which must in any case come up for reappointment every seven years. "It is the custom of the Senate to select for fellowship only such persons as are Professors in some one of the five ["approved"] Colleges. In fact, the President of each College has practically the appointment of the Fellows assigned to his College, as . . . the person nominated by him is in every case elected by the Senate. It may also be mentioned that a Fellow holds his fellowship only so long as he retains his professorship in the College with which he was connected at the time of his appointment as Fellow." [21]

With Senators appointed on the half-and-half principle, and a necessary working understanding that the same principle shall apply to the appointment of all teachers and examiners, it is easy to fancy the severity of the religious test. In Ireland we do not complain of this, since we are all—Protestants as well as Catholics—in fact, whatever we may be theoretically, in favour of denominational education. The absence of formal tests is part of the huge sham under which we starve, mentally as well as economically; a sham which, to tell the truth, is not confined to Ireland.

The Royal University has out of State funds an annual income of £20,000. This is "supplemented by the fees received from the students, and by the interest on certain investments made in the early years of the University, when the receipts were considerably in excess of the expenditure. In the year 1900-01 these investments, which then represented £48,000, yielded an interest of £1,884; and the fees of students amounted to £3,880; so that the total income of the University in that year was, roughly, £25,765." [22] Of this sum £4,918 were expended on administration, *i. e.*, on office salaries and allowances, traveling expenses of members of the Senate, stationery, printing, and other incidental expenses. A sum of £5,713 was distributed as rewards to students in the form of exhibitions [and other prizes]; while as large a sum as £13,766 represented the cost of examination. As regards the latter sum it is important to note

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[22] *Final Report* of Robertson Commission, p. 9.

that it includes £8,499 paid as salaries to Fellows, and £2,765 paid as remuneration to Examiners,[23] who, it will be remembered, are employed as teachers in " approved " Colleges.

" The seat of the University [as distinguished from the five Colleges] is in Dublin, where buildings suitable for offices and examination halls have been provided by the State. The buildings of the University also contain a Library, a Museum, and excellent Laboratories; but these are used solely for examination purposes. . . . The total expenditure . . . in connection with the purchase, alteration, extension, and maintenance of the University buildings since its foundation, has amounted [at the date of the Final Report from which I quote] to £91,779." [24]

The total number of candidates for examination by the University was 3,733 in 1906—an increase of 259 over that of the preceding year. Of these 3,733 there entered for Matriculation 1504, of whom but 993 passed. Those who passed one or other of the University examinations, including Matriculation, came to 2,388, 1,156 being rejected, and 189 either retiring or not presenting themselves, though entered on the lists.[25]

It is not easy to ascertain with exactness the total number of *bona fide* students in the University, as some of those who fail to pass one or other of the examinations continue their studies and come up again.[26] I am not quite sure, moreover, whether the figure 2,388, of those who passed, represents so many different individuals, as it is possible that same individual may have passed more than one examination. Besides, that figure is swollen by 993 who are reported as having passed merely for Matriculation; and, judging by analogy from preceding years, it is safe to conclude that very nearly half of the matriculated students pass no further examination and cannot be reckoned among the *bona fide* students of the University.[27] Setting off

[23] *Ibid.* [24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Twenty-fifth Report of the University* (for 1906), p. 18.

[26] Having once passed an examination one can present oneself for the next examination after an interval of years. This makes it impossible for the Secretaries to tell the number of the students, except by giving the number of those who present themselves for examination in any one year.

[27] For the quinquennial period 1900-1904 the average number matricu-

these against those who, having matriculated, failed to pass any higher examination but remained *bona fide* students, the number of those who passed any of the examinations—2,388—would represent the number of students in the University.

No official cognisance is taken of the religion of the students. The list, however, of those who passed the different examinations, as found in the University Calendar, gives, after the names of the candidates, the places where they studied, thereby supplying those who know Ireland with a rough but sufficiently accurate means of ascertaining their religion. I have gone through the list of those who matriculated in 1906 and found the proportion of Catholics to Protestants to be about 2 :1. It must be borne in mind that this is but a rough estimate, as there is a large number—especially of those who prepared for the examination by private study—whose religious belief we have no means of ascertaining, except that it is fairly safe to presume that for them the proportion is substantially the same as for the others.

Accordingly, on the supposition that the total number of students was 2,388 in 1906, and that two-thirds were Catholics, there should have been 1,559 *bona fide* Catholic students in the University.[28]

Here again, as in the Intermediate system, we have two-thirds of the numbers, but must be content with merely a moiety of the offices and ruling power.

lated yearly was 729, of whom 322 on the average are reported as having passed no further examination (*Report of the University* for 1906, p. 17).

[28] In his evidence before the Robertson Commission (*Appendix to Second Report*, nn. 6602 sqq.) Mgr. Molloy, Rector of the Catholic University, said that he estimated the number of non-Catholic University students at that date in Ireland at 1,500. The number of Catholic students who would be likely to enter the proposed new College in Dublin which he advocated, he estimated at 700 to start with, rising to 1,000 in a few years, and in the course of ten or fifteen years to 2,000. The difference between his estimate and mine may possibly be accounted for by the fact that the number of students who came up for examination at the Royal University increased very considerably, from 2,685 in 1901, when his evidence was given, to 3,733 in 1906—the number on which my estimate is based. There can be little doubt that the great body of this increase is on the Catholic side.

iv. The Queen's Colleges.

Among the Colleges "approved" by the Senate of the Royal University—in the sense of being allowed the advantage of the teaching of the Fellows of that institution, and of having practically all the Examiners taken from their staff—the Queen's Colleges hold a position of special interest, inasmuch as all three, and only they, are directly endowed by the State. They were established, as has been said, in 1845, one in the chief town of each of the provinces of Ulster, Munster, and Connaught; Trinity College being supposed to meet the needs of Leinster. "A sum of £100,000 was then provided for the purchase of sites and the erection and equipment of the Colleges, and an annual grant, not exceeding £7,000 for each College, was placed on the Consolidated Fund. The sum of £100,000 allocated to buildings and equipment, . . . was supplemented before the Colleges were opened by a grant of £12,000 for the outfit of Museums, Libraries, and other departments. In addition to this endowment each College has received since the year 1854 an annual Parliamentary Grant of about £1,600 in aid of expenses of maintenance. At present each of the Colleges contains, besides an Examination Hall and ordinary lecture rooms, a Library, Museums, Laboratories, and residences for the President and the Registrar." [29]

The direct endowment by the State is increased by the amount spent annually by the Commissioners of Public Works (Ireland) on the different Colleges, for new works, maintenance and supplies, furniture and fittings, rent, fuel, light, water, etc.; which averaged £2,680 for the quinquennial period 1896-7 to 1900-1.[30] There are other sources of direct endowment. "In an able pamphlet published last year (1904), Dr. Delaney, S. J., points out that 'the estimates for the past three years, 1901-2-3, show that the total expenditure on the three Colleges in three years amounted respectively to £34,098, £34,916, and £34,966; and

[29] *Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 10.
[30] *Appendix to First Report* of Robertson Commission, p. 286.

this last sum, £34,966, is also the estimate for the current year (1903-4).' Including the charge involved in the original outlay, the total cost to the tax-payer is £38,000 a year." [31]

"The Colleges are identical in their constitution; they are undenominational, and the Professors are forbidden, by the Statutes of the Colleges, to teach any doctrine or make any statement derogatory to the truths of revealed religion, or injurious or disrespectful to the religious convictions of any portion of their class or audience, or to introduce or discuss political or polemical subjects." This regulation affects only official utterances; outside their lectures, apparently, there is no formal restriction, though there might be and is a very real one. "The President and Professors in each case are appointed by the Crown [which means Dublin Castle] and constitute the 'body politic and corporate' of the College. The Council of each College, in which are vested powers of general government and administration, consists of the President and six Professors elected by the Corporate Body. . . .

"No Halls of Residence for students have been provided in connection with the Colleges, but, in accordance with the Statutes, boarding-houses are licensed by the Presidents for the reception of students. The Statutes also provide for the appointment of Deans of Residence, whose functions are to 'have the moral care and spiritual charge of the students of their respective creeds residing in the licensed boarding-houses.' These officers receive no remuneration from public funds; they are appointed by the Crown, but before they can assume or hold office they must be approved by the constituted authorities of their Church or Denomination. Owing to the objections of the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland to the constitution of the Colleges, no Deans of Residence for Roman Catholic students exist in any of these institutions." [32]

It is a matter of history that at the time of the establishment of the Queen's Colleges considerable difference of opinion prevailed among Catholics in Ireland—the clergy, and even the

[31] M. O'Riordan, *Catholicity and Progress in Ireland*, p. 466.
[32] *Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, pp. 10-11.

Bishops, as well as the laity—as to whether it would be prudent to accept and make use of them. The question was referred to Rome, which decided against acceptance; and the Synod of Thurles not only issued a decree in condemnation, but punished by suspension *ipso facto* any priest who might take in any of them the office whether of Dean or Professor.[33]

Notwithstanding the condemnation, a small number of Catholic students have attended the Colleges since their foundation—especially that of Cork. In 1851, immediately after the Synod of Thurles, the number was 136; at which figure it remained, practically, till 1860, when it exceeded 200. It grew to 331 in 1881; after which, on the foundation of the Royal University, it declined.[34] In 1906-7 it was 179.

v. The Catholic University.

This institution, which, as such, has no State recognition or endowment, consists at present of a number of associated Colleges situated for the most part in or near Dublin. Each of these constituent Colleges retains its own independent organization, but all are expected to work together for the advancement of the higher education of Catholics. The Colleges are: University College, Dublin, over which Newman presided in the early days of the University; St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, where the great body of the diocesan clergy of Ireland are educated; the Catholic University School of Medicine, Dublin; University College, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, conducted by the Fathers of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost; Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, Dublin, the ecclesiastical seminary for the diocese; and St. Patrick's College, Carlow. The connection between these various institutions is so slight, and there is so little in the way of means of uniting them into one organic whole, that the Catholic University of Ireland, as such, may be

[33] The documents will be found in the *Appendix to the Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, pp. 12-14. See also Minutes of Evidence, nn. 7018, 7019, 7020; and Document put in by Dr. G. J. Stoney, *Appendix to Third Report* of same Commission, p. 588.

[34] See Diagram put in evidence by Dr. Stoney, *Appendix to Second Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 315.

said to have existed only on paper for a goodly number of years. There is, as far as I know, but one University official, the Rector, whose office, however remunerated, is practically a sinecure.

Before dismissing this paper University, however, and turning to the Colleges which are supposed to constitute it, it may be interesting to note that it was at one time a reality; a mere germ, no doubt; but a germ which, if it had been kept alive and cultivated, as it might have been, would have placed Irish Catholics in a different position from that in which they find themselves today. It was founded in 1854, as a result of the condemnation of the Queen's Colleges, when the ecclesiastical authorities felt that something should be done to meet the educational needs of the people.[35]

In his evidence before the Robertson Commission[36] Dr. O'Dwyer, the Bishop of Limerick, said: "He had seen it stated, and had reason to believe it was true, that at that time in a very few years Irish Catholics subscribed as much as £250,000 for the maintenance of their University." It would be a mistake, however, to think that so large a sum as this was ever

[35] The first Rescript from Propaganda, in connection with the Queen's Colleges, contains the following sentence: "Opportunum S. Congr. fore duceret si, collatis viribus, Catholicam academiam, ad illius instar quae per Belgii antistites in civitate Lovaniensi fundata est, in Hibernia quoque erigendam episcopi curarent." This was in Oct., 1847. The second Rescript (Oct. 11, 1848) is still more pressing: "Cum autem innotescat quanto studio clerus et integra natio pro iis adlaborent quae ad bonum Ecclesiae promovendum referuntur, de Universitate Catholica erigenda Emmi Patres haud desperandum censuerunt; imo consilium huiusmodi iterum iterumque commendarunt, ut in eiusdem erectionem omnes pro viribus operam suam conferant, sicque pleniori Catholicorum instructioni satisfiat, quin ullum exinde eorundem religio detrimentum patiatur. Quam SS. Congr. sententia SSmus D. Noster omni maturitate et prudentia perpensam auctoritatis suae pondere probandam confirmandamque esse duxit, voluitque eam quatuor archiepiscopis remitti, respectivis per eos suffraganeis communicandam." Under pressure of this advice, as also, no doubt, of the necessity felt at home, the following statute was enacted by the National Synod of Thurles (1850): "Ut sanae educationi iuventutis Catholicae provideamus, et iteratis commendationibus a Sede Apostolica datis inhaereamus, muneris nostri esse arbitramur totis viribus conari ut quamprimum, collatis consiliis, Universitatem Catholicam in Hibernia erigendam curemus." All these documents are published in the *Appendix to the Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, pp. 12-13.

[36] *Appendix to First Report*, p. 18.

at any one time in the hands of the Trustees. At first there were considerable contributions; and later yearly collections were made in the different dioceses, which were spent, as they came in, on the up-keep of the University. No chairs or laboratories were endowed; which, as I am disposed to think, was the main cause of the complete collapse of the institution; of which nothing now remains but two small groups of buildings occupied by University College, Dublin, and the Catholic University School of Medicine. Even the University Chapel, built, I understand, in great, if not even for the most, part by funds in Dr. Newman's possession or at his disposal, has been converted to parochial uses; so that there is not even a centre where all the Catholic young men who are engaged in university studies in the city of Dublin may attend religious services and receive instructions specially provided for men of their condition. There are services and instructions of a more or less domestic character here and there, but no public University service and preaching such as Newman intended, and which should form one of the most interesting and useful features of university life.

vi. University College and the Catholic University School of Medicine.

These two institutions work together to a considerable extent, though not so closely as if they were homes of different faculties in one great living university. Both are approved by the Royal University as places in which the Fellows employed by that body may teach; and are further subsidized by having many of their Professors who are not Fellows of the Royal University selected and paid to conduct its examinations.

University College is situated in St. Stephen's Green, near the centre of Dublin, and since 1883 has been in charge of the Jesuit Fathers, who employ or are assisted by a certain number of lay teachers. In his evidence before the Robertson Commission Fr. Delaney, S. J., then President of the College said that the number of his staff at that time was "twenty-two; of these eight were Jesuits, of whom three were engaged in administration, and five were Professors and Fellows of the Royal Uni-

versity. The remaining fourteen were laymen, of whom ten were permanent Professors and Fellows of the Royal University; the other four were tutors." [37] That was in 1901; there has been, I think, very little change since.

Looking over the Lecture List of the College for the Session 1901-2, which is published in the *Appendix to the Third Report* of the Robertson Commission (p. 559), I find that it comprises Greek, Latin, English, Irish, French, German, Italian, History, Mathematics, Chemistry, Experimental Physics, Mathematical Physics, Biology, Zoology, Mental Science, and two lectures on Religion per week, one for each of two separate classes of the students. There were in addition two lectures a week on Political Economy,[38] and ten Afternoon Lectures, to be delivered in the Aula Maxima, on general subjects, were scheduled for 1902.

Returning to the evidence given orally by the President of the College before the Royal Commission (nn. 1192 ff.), I find the average number of the students set down by him as 180 to 200, of whom about ten per cent. would be non-Catholics. Women were admitted to lectures, with considerable restriction, necessitated (the President said) by lack of proper lecture-rooms. The necessity is not admitted by all the women students, I understand. The equipment of the College Fr. Delaney described (n. 1224) as "utterly," and the premises as "extremely" inadequate. "We have," he said, "little more than the bed-rooms of two private houses for our class-rooms." "And you have none of the usual equipments!" queried the Chairman of the Commission; to which the reply was "No" (n. 1227). To a previous question, about equipment (n. 1184), the reply was: "We are gradually trying to provide a laboratory—a chemical laboratory, and also a physical laboratory. We have a very moderate equipment now; but with good teachers and clever students we do some good work." Since this evidence was given additional (temporary) lecture-halls have been provided at the rear of the houses in which the College is situated.

Interrogated as regards resources, Fr. Delaney testified (n.

[37] *Appendix to First Report*, n. 1172.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 560.

1186) that the resources of his College were "none, with the exception of the fees. The fees are moderate, the nominal fee being fifteen guineas (£15.15.0) for teaching, but very many of our students being poor, we do not exact the full fees from them. We established lectures in the evening, for which there is only a nominal fee of six guineas for the whole year. . . . About £800 would represent the average yearly fees coming in from the students." This would mean that, putting the number of students at 200, the average fee paid would be £4 a year each; or, for the whole course of four years, £16; with examination fees at the Royal University, £20; as against £83, the total cost, in fees, of a degree in Trinity College. In those cases, however, in which students can afford and are made to pay the full fee of fifteen guineas a year in University College, the total cost, in fees, of a degree obtained by study at that place, would be £67; not much of a difference, on the score of cost, between the two institutions.

Interrogated as to endowment, Fr. Delaney said (n. 1187) the College had "no endowment whatsoever. I have never received any help from outside." He referred, of course, to direct endowment, in the shape of money coming to the College, as such; for we have seen that indirectly, in the way of payment of professors, who are examiners at the Royal University, and for that reason as well as for the quality of their teaching draw to their lectures a goodly number of the very best students, University College has an endowment which its President would be the last to despise. Moreover, for the past two years, to head off a move made by the friends of Trinity College with a view to attract thither the most successful students at the Intermediate Examinations, a number of Scholarships, tenable only at University College, have been provided by members of the Irish Catholic body. How long this will last or will be needed, no one can tell.

As regards the government of the College, the President testified (n. 1188) that "up to the present it has been practically autocratic, that is, governed by the Rector. . . . We have recently established a Council which will govern with me almost

identically on the lines of the President and Council of the Queen's Colleges." The powers of this Council must be limited, as the programme of University College is practically dictated by the Senate of the Royal University, and Professors at the College are appointed and dismissible by the President himself.

"The Catholic University School of Medicine stands on a footing somewhat different from that of University College. It is managed by a Board of Governors. . . . This Board is a Body Corporate, with perpetual succession and a common seal. . . . . Thus the Catholic University School of Medicine has a legal position in the eyes of the State, comparable with that of the other Medical Schools in Ireland governed by chartered bodies." This extract is taken from the evidence submitted to the Robertson Commission by Mgr. Molloy, who then held the position of Rector of the Catholic University of Ireland [39] He continues:

"The School was founded by the Catholic Bishops in 1855. The buildings were purchased and equipped out of monies collected from the people of Ireland. . . . The teaching staff were paid for many years by means of an annual collection made for the purpose, and the cost of maintenance was met partly out of the same annual collection, and partly out of capital. [These were the same capital and annual collections out of which the whole Catholic University was supported, as stated on p. 240]. But about twenty years ago [that is, twenty years before Dec., 1901] the capital fund of the University was exhausted, and it was found no longer possible to continue the annual collection. Since then the Professors have received no salaries, and the cost of maintaining the buildings and equipment has been a first charge on the fees paid by the students. What remains of the fees, after this charge is defrayed, is divided between the Professors and the Lecturers. . . . The buildings and equipment, as they stand, and the small income of £55 a year [which is devoted to prizes for the students] constitute the sole endowment of the School."

[39] *Appendix to Second Report*, p. 152.

There is, of course, the indirect endowment already mentioned, which consists in the appointment and payment of the Professors as Fellows and Examiners in the Royal University. Of eight Medical Fellowships three are held by Professors in the Catholic University School, as against four in the three Queen's Colleges; whilst of fifteen Examiners who are not Fellows, five belong to the Catholic University School, as against an equal number in Belfast and two in Cork. This carries with it, of course, the usual enticement to students.

There is, moreover, one of the best forms of endowment, consisting in the fact that throughout four-fifths of Ireland, where the local governing bodies are in the hands of Catholics, it has become very difficult for one who has not been educated at this school to obtain an appointment as Dispensary Doctor or as physician to any institution under local control. This fact alone gives the School a practical monopoly of the education of the Medical Doctors of Catholic Ireland.

" The number of students in the Catholic University School of Medicine," Mgr. Molloy proceeds, " has been rapidly increasing of late years. . . and I am informed that it is now the largest of all the Medical Schools in Ireland as regards the number of its students." He submitted a Table " showing the number of students attending lectures in the Medical Schools of the Catholic University and of each of the three Queen's Colleges, in each year from 1886-7 to 1900-1." From this Table it appears that the Catholic University School began that period with 105 students, and that the number rose almost steadily to 260, in 1900-1; whereas, though the number in Belfast remained practically unchanged at about 230, it fell steadily in the other two Queen's Colleges, from 176 to 130 in Cork, and from 45 to 29 in Galway. Another Medical School, to which a great many Catholic students of Medicine used to resort, the Royal College of Surgeons, shows a like shrinkage, as far as the number of its students can be ascertained, from 170 in 1896-7 to 125 in 1900-1.[40] In the Medical School of Trinity College there were in all on May 1st, 1906, about 253 students.[41]

[40] *Appendix to Second Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 158, Table IV.

[41] See *Appendix to the Final Report* of the Royal Commission on Trinity

Dealing with the buildings and equipment of the Catholic University School of Medicine, Mgr. Molloy told the Commission, "that the buildings, originally intended for about 100 students, are totally inadequate, even with the additions we have made to them, to furnish accommodation for the immense number now crowded into them. One unfortunate result of this deficiency of accommodation is, that in some cases it doubles the labor of our teaching staff, some of our Professors being obliged to divide their classes into two sections, and give every lecture twice over." [42]

In Dec., 1901, when Mgr. Molloy gave this evidence before the Royal Commission, the Governing Body of the College was composed of eleven members: the Archbishop of Dublin, another Bishop (representing the Episcopal Body), two other clergymen (the Rector of the Catholic University and the Dean of Residence, University College), and seven laymen (the Dean of the Medical Faculty, three representatives of the Faculty, and three representatives of medical science). All were Catholics.

The Medical Faculty at the same time comprised ten Professors, who were assisted in teaching by thirteen others. Though there was no formal religious test, all but one of these Professors were Catholics.[43]

vii. The Royal College of Science.

I pass over the other constituent Colleges of the Catholic University, as, with the exception of Maynooth, to which I shall return later on, they are not likely to survive as Colleges of any new and living University that may be founded. I am thus brought to the Royal College of Science, which is likely to flourish and may be frequented by Catholics.

It is "an institution for supplying an advanced course of instruction in Science as applied to Agriculture and the Industrial

College, p. 337. The total number of students of Medicine in Ireland would be about 1,026; out of all proportion to the needs of the country itself. A large number of those who graduate or become qualified to act as physicians, find employment in the army and navy, and in the Colonies.

[42] *Appendix to Second Report* of Robertson Commission, p. 154.

[43] See Mgr. Molloy's evidence, l. c., n. 6644.

Arts; for training teachers for technical and intermediate schools in which science is taught; and for carrying out scientific research. The College embraces three Faculties, viz., Applied Chemistry, Agriculture, and Engineering. Students who desire to obtain the diploma of Associate which is granted by the College, are called 'Associate' students, and must attend a course of instruction extending over three years, and pass the prescribed examinations. . . . Students who are not taking a complete course of study, but who attend the College for single subjects, for occasional lectures, or for special laboratory work, are called 'Non-Associates.' No student is admitted to the College under the age of sixteen years. Certain students who are qualified to carry out research are allowed to devote their whole time to work in the laboratories under the direction of a Professor. The College also grants the diploma of Fellowship to students who, after receiving the diploma of Associateship, remain at least a fourth year in the College and submit an approved thesis containing the result of original investigations. The College lectures and laboratories are open to women on the same terms as to men. . . .

"The teaching staff consists of eight Professors, five Lecturers, and ten Assistants; and the subjects of instruction are: Chemistry, Physics, Mechanical Engineering, Agriculture, Mathematics, Geology, Botany and Zoology. The Albert Farm, at Glasnevin [near Dublin] . . . is used in connection with the instruction in Agriculture. . . . The Professors of the College constitute the College Council, which is presided over by one of their number, who is called the Dean of Faculty. . . . The salaries of the Professors vary from £600 to £700, of the Lecturers from £350 to £450, and those of the Assistants average £150 per annum. All appointments in connection with the College are now made by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland," [45] which is itself manned by the British Government, and may be depended on not to appoint any one, no matter how well qualified, who is not a supporter of the present form of the English connection. Of course, there is no

[45] *Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 21.

formal religious test; but the informal test must be pretty efficacious, seeing that, after thirty years of existence as a College, teaching in the heart of the Catholic capital of a Catholic country, there are on the staff but two Catholics out of 23 Professors, Lecturers, and Assistants.

"The College is maintained by an annual Parliamentary Vote, the students' fees being appropriated in aid of the Vote. . . . In the year 1900-1 the cost of the College to the State (exclusive of the cost of maintenance, furniture, lighting, stationery, printing, etc., which is defrayed by the Board of Public Works and the Stationery Office) was £8,008. The fees payable by Associate students are £15 for the first year, £20 for the second year, and £20 for the third. These fees cover attendance at all lectures and laboratory and workshop courses, as well as the use of the College apparatus and materials. For Non-Associate students the fee for any course of lectures is £2, while for such students the fees for practical courses vary from £2 for a special course of one month to £12 for the entire Session.

"Special provision is made by means of Scholarships, Short Summer Courses, and otherwise, for the training of Teachers in Science and Technological subjects. . . . The number of students attending the College during the Session 1901-2 was 123, of whom sixty were Associate students, and sixty-three were Non-Associate students. . . . No official information is available as to the religious professions of the students, but we understand that about 50 per cent. are Roman Catholics." [45]

viii. St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Maynooth College celebrated the centenary of its establishment twelve years ago—in 1895. It is fifteen miles west of Dublin, on a line of railway which passes through a rich, flat, pastoral, and very much depopulated country, and so can give very little facilities for travel. Whatever the cause may be,

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22. I have noted already, in connection with the Primary Education system, that Catholics are always called "Roman Catholics" by the English Government officials in Ireland, the Protestants having some pretension to form a branch of the Catholic Church.

there is little intercourse between the Professors at Maynooth and those even of University College and the Catholic University School of Medicine, a circumstance that cannot be too deeply deplored.

The College is not only strictly denominational, Catholic, but intended solely for the education of the diocesan clergy of Ireland. It is an ecclesiastical seminary in the strictest sense. Accordingly, the students are all resident and subject to the ordinary discipline of ecclesiastical seminaries. They are enrolled as belonging to some one of the Catholic dioceses in Ireland,—intended, that is, to be incorporated on ordination into its clergy. This is a necessary condition of entrance to and permanence in the College; though after ordination many of those who study at Maynooth find service out of Ireland.

Up to 1845 the College received from the British Treasury, out of Irish taxes, an annual grant which varied from about £8,000 to £9,000. In 1845 this grant was raised to £26,360 and a sum of £30,000 was given for buildings. When the (Protestant) Church of Ireland was disestablished in 1869, the annual grant was withdrawn and the sum of £369,040, being four times the annual grant, was paid as compensation out of the Church Surplus to the Trustees of the College. The present annual income of the College consists of the interest on the invested capital thus obtained, which yields about £8,856; students' fees, which amount to about £6,000 a year; and the interest on certain private endowments. The total income of the College from all sources in the financial year ending 30th June,1901, amounted to £24,881.[46]

The buildings are spacious but plain—all but the College chapel, which is large and elegant. They include Professors' rooms, cloisters, infirmaries, chapel and oratories, a library of about 40,000 volumes, a theatre and public lecture-hall, classrooms, and a physical laboratory; they provide accommodation moreover, for about 600 resident students. The total expenditure on buildings since the foundation of the College has been about £201,713, the greater part of which was derived from

[46] *Final Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 19.

savings on income and private donations. It includes, however, certain grants from the State amounting to about £54,712.[47]

The College is governed by seventeen Trustees, all Bishops. The staff consists of a President, Vice-President, two Deans of Discipline, two Spiritual Fathers, a Bursar, Prefect of the Dunboyne (or higher) Course (who is also Librarian), eighteen Professors, and twelve Lecturers (all of whom are laymen).

There are four Faculties: Theology, Canon Law, Philosophy, and Arts; each governed by its own Statutes, but all subject to the General Statutes of the College. Degrees in Theology, Canon Law, and Philosophy, are conferred by authority obtained from the Holy See. All the Arts and Philosophy students graduate in the Royal University,—an arrangement which has prevailed only for three years; no one is admitted to these courses who has not matriculated in the University. Should a student at his entrance have already passed one of the higher examinations of the University, he is assigned at Maynooth to the grade or class that is preparing for the next examination which he must pass to obtain the degree of B. A., without which no one is allowed to enter on his theological studies.

The ordinary course of Theology covers four years, after which the degree of Bachelor in Theology as well as that of Bachelor in Canon Law can be obtained. There is provision for a further course of special study, in Philosophy, Canon Law, and Theology, on what is known as the Dunboyne Establishment—so named because it is largely supported by a bequest left to the College in 1800 by Lord Dunboyne.[48]

ix. Proposals for Reform.

From the preceding statement it will be seen that there can be no doubt as to the fundamental fact, recognized by everybody in Ireland, "that there is at present in that country no fairly well equipped teaching body which Catholics trust with the higher education of young laymen." Not Trinity College nor the Queen's Colleges, since Catholics do not trust them; not the Col-

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[48] *Ibid*, p. 20.

lege of Science, since its course is too limited, and even within these limits it shares in the distrust with which Trinity and the Queen's Colleges are regarded by the Catholic body; not Maynooth, since no layman can enter there; and, finally, not University College and the Catholic University School of Medicine, since, however trusted they may be, they are but miserably equipped. All, as has been said, are agreed on this, and there are many different projects of reform; all of which can be reduced to two classes: (1) the remodelling of Trinity and the Queen's Colleges so as to make them acceptable to Catholics; and (2) the establishment in Dublin, with University College and the Catholic University School of Medicine as nuclei, of a new College that might be Catholic in the sense in which Trinity College is Protestant. I purpose now to examine both these proposals, deferring to a further section the consideration of the position of the theological faculty and the education of priests generally, as that question is of special importance.

A) As to the possibility of reforming Trinity and the Queen's Colleges so as make them acceptable to Catholics, there are among Catholics themselves, practically, but two opinions; one favourable to the reform of all these institutions; the other opposed to all reform of Trinity, but in favour of accepting the Colleges, when reformed, of Cork and Galway. It will be well to note here that practically the whole Catholic body in Munster and Connaught, laity, priests, and bishops, are in favour of such a modification of the Queen's Colleges situated in these Provinces as would make them suitable for the higher education of Catholic young men. The attitude that prevailed from 1845 to 1850 prevails no longer; the Catholic students of the Cork College have been formed, with the President of the College and some of the Professors, into a recognized Church confraternity with an approved chaplain; and the priests and people of Munster think Catholic young men at least as safe in Cork at the Queen's College as they would be in Dublin at either University College or the Catholic University Medical School.[49]

[49] The Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland (the Robertson Commission) reported in 1903 in favour of such modifications of the constitution of the Queen's Colleges as would make those at Cork and

There has been question of reducing this College at Galway to the position of a Technical School; and resolutions have been passed by public bodies, stimulated by the Bishops, against this proposition, denouncing it as an injustice to the Province.

As regards Trinity College, Dublin, there has been and is diversity of opinion; though the great majority, guided by the Bishops, are opposed to making any terms with that institution.

Those who were in favour of accepting a reformed Trinity College presented to the Royal Commission on that institution the following Statement, which was signed, towards the end of July, 1906, by 467 laymen,[50] who, it is well known, have numerous sympathisers who did not sign:

"No solution of the University difficulty in Ireland, based upon Trinity College being constituted as the sole College of a National University, can be accepted as satisfactory as long as it fails to provide for: (*a*) A substantial representation [of

Galway acceptable to Catholics, leaving both their university status, that in Galway somewhat shorn and only as a trial. (*Final Report*, p. 43). This Report was signed by the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, now Archbishop of Tuam, one of the members of the Commission, who adds a note (p. 62) in which he says he regards it as doubtful whether the modifications suggested by the Commission would be adequate to secure for the two Colleges the sympathy and support of Catholics; but goes on to express an opinion that these could be secured, and a hope that they would be, by further modifications, which he suggests. In a formal statement presented in 1906 to the Royal Commission on Trinity College, the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland say they had long since expressed their willingness to consider favourably a solution of the University question on the lines of the Report of the Robertson Commission (See *Appendix to Final Report* to the Robertson Commission on Trinity College, p. 82). A Committee of Catholic Laymen in Cork, consisting of about thirty members, who were elected in 1904 at an exceedingly large meeting of the Catholic laity of Cork presided over by the Mayor, presented to the same Robertson Commission on Trinity College a statement to the effect that the Queen's College in their city could be made acceptable to Catholics (*Ibid.*, p. 118). It is a matter of public notoriety that this attitude has the approval of most, if not all, of the Bishops of the Province. For other documents in support see *Appendix to Final Report* on Trinity College, pp. 447-452.

[50] Seven of the signatories afterwards withdrew their names; three of them stating they did so in view of the fact that the representation on the Governing Body was, as we shall see, interpreted by the friends of the reform within the College less substantially than they—these signatories—had intended.

Catholics] from the start upon the Governing Body, with a power of expansion of such representation dependent upon and fairly proportionate to the number of students whom Catholics send into the College, and the Academic distinctions which they may there win; (*b*) the establishment of dual professorships in at least Mental and Moral Science and in History; (*c*) the religious instruction of our students by clergymen of our own Church; (*d*) the establishment of a Faculty of Catholic Theology on terms of full equality with those enjoyed by Protestants; (*e*) the establishment of a chapel for our students within the College; (*f*) the creation of a Council or other Body to secure the practical efficiency of the safeguards provided for our students in religion, faith, and dogma." [51]

This proposal came to be known as the "Bonn Scheme," because it was founded on a statement obtained by Mr. George Fottrell, a Dublin gentleman, from one of the Professors in the University of Bonn, as to the provision made therein for safeguarding the faith of Catholic students.[52]

Shortly after the foregoing document was presented to the Commission and published in the daily press, another Statement, signed by twenty of the Fellows and Professors of Trinity College itself and one ex-Fellow (a member of the College Council),[53] was also presented and published, showing that the

[51] The Statement is published in full in the *Appendix to the First Report* of the Robertson Commission on Trinity College, p. 110.

[52] For this document see *Appendix to Final Report* of Commission on Trinity College, p. 409.

[53] The Statement was approved by more of the College staff than those by whom it was signed, as appears from what the Provost said in his oral evidence (n. 32): "We kept a number of our Staff here during the vacation discussing the matter, and the reasons the names put to it were not more in number was that they all scattered the next day; but the division was about twenty to four in favor of the Scheme." Again, in reply to one of the Commissioners (Mr. Kelleher), the Provost said that if the Catholic Bishops accepted the scheme, it would be approved by a majority of the Staff of the College, but opposed by the Board, as also, very violently, by some of those on the Staff who hold to old-fashioned views (*Ibid.*, nn. 41-43). It would not be difficult, I think, to get Parliament to override this opposition to a reform which, reasonable in itself, was admitted to be so by the majority of the Trinity College Staff; provided it were also accepted by the Catholic body as supplying a satisfactory solution of the University question in Ireland.

reform advocated from without by the Catholic Laymen was not without powerful support within the College. The twenty-one Trinity men endorsed all the claims of the Catholic Laymen, subject to certain modifications:

(*a*) Catholics, they thought, would be adequately represented on the Governing Body of the College if they were allowed, for a period of twenty-five years, one-fourth of the seats on a Reformed Board, together with their chance, as time went on, of further seats, by election on the part of the younger Fellows and Professors, as also of the Moderators or Scholars; which bodies might be expected to be largely composed of Catholics after a few years. The remaining claims (*b, c, d, e, f*), were allowed almost without alteration, a special paragraph being added providing that the Catholic University School of Medicine "should be brought into the settlement." The claim for appointment of dual professorships in Mental and Moral Science and History, was made more definite by a clause to the effect that the Catholic Professors in these departments should be appointed by and subject to a nominated committee of six members, of whom four should be laymen, which should be charged with the duty of safeguarding the faith and morals of Catholic students. Professors in the Faculty of Theology would be appointed by the Bishops and work under their direction.[54]

Meanwhile the opponents of this proposal, as indeed of every scheme for the reform of Trinity College, were not idle. The Standing Committee of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops met in Dublin on July 25th, the day after the signature of the Statement presented by the twenty-one Fellows and Professors, and drew up a Statement in which they "inform the Royal Commission that under no circumstances will the Catholics of Ireland accept a system of mixed education in Trinity College as a solution of their claims," and giving the reasons on which this decision was based.[55] The document was published immediately in the daily press, and had the effect of stopping at

[54] See this Statement published in full, *Ibid.*, p. 23. It is plain that the signatories to the two documents worked in collaboration; this, indeed, was stated by the Provost of Trinity College in his oral evidence (n. 3).

[55] The Statement is published in full. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

once among Catholics the agitation in favour of a reform of Trinity College so as to make it acceptable to them.

The Bishops assign six minor reasons as influencing their decision: (1) that the acceptance of Trinity College by Catholics would result in making it the only university in Ireland, which would be bad policy from the educational point of view; (2) that Trinity is not popular; (3) that it is a rich man's college; (4) that it is old and has made for itself a groove which is unsuited to the present needs of Irishmen; (5) that Catholics could never hope to be more than a helpless minority of its members; and (6) that the mingling of two religious elements in almost equal proportions would not make for religious or academic peace.

Two other objections their Lordships deemed "of more importance, because they touch on principle." The first of these is of special interest: "It has been the hope of the Bishops that, sooner or later, they should have a University, or at least a University College, in which they might maintain a Theological Faculty. That would be impossible in Trinity College, Dublin. To Catholics, at all events, it is evident that their ecclesiastical students could not be sent to reside there." The second objection is that "the inevitable result of an attempt to set up, for the first time in the history of universities, an institution of the kind [that is, a College, not a University, which would be both Protestant and Catholic] would, as regards religion, be negative—that is, the exclusion of all religion. That is mixed education in its most pernicious development, and the Catholics of Ireland who have borne for long years the penalties of their resistance to this system, can hardly be expected, now, to be parties to imposing it on themselves."

This important Statement of the Bishops practically exhausts all the objections that have been urged against the attempt to make Trinity College as acceptable to Irish Catholics as the University of Bonn is to their brethren in Germany. Some opponents of the proposal insisted more strongly on the defects of the present educational system of the College; others on its traditional opposition to Irish national ideals. These considerations were, no doubt, deemed important; but what destroyed the

prospects of the proposed reform was one argument and only one —that a University condemned, however, foolishly or unjustly, by the episcopal body, would never be accepted by Irish Catholics. Within and without the College, by supporters as well as opponents of the proposal, whether Protestant or Catholic, this one objection was rightly regarded as fatal.

B) The alternative scheme of reform was to establish in Dublin a new College that would be Catholic in the sense in which Trinity College is Protestant; that is, with no formal tests, but governed, at least in the main, by Catholics, who would be relied on to see that the body of the professorate and the atmosphere of the place were Catholic. There were and are differences of opinion as to whether this College should form part of the University of Dublin or of the Royal University. That it should be a self-sufficing, independent University is not regarded as practical; though hopes are entertained that it might grow into that, all the sooner if it were linked with the Queen's Colleges in the Royal University. These differences of opinion are of minor importance; what should be carefully attended to, in the first place, is the constitution and government of the proposed new College.

Now, though this is still to a very large extent a matter of speculation, I note, as agreed upon by all, that it is not to be so much a Catholic College as a College for Catholics; a very important distinction, in my opinion. During the whole of Cardinal Cullen's time—that is, for about thirty years after the controversy about University Education in Ireland had become acute by reason of the establishment of the Queen's Colleges—the Catholic demand was for a Catholic University; meaning thereby a University or College in which, however, it might be endowed or supported, the Canon Law of the Catholic Church would rule, so that no one would be admitted to office or continue to hold it, except in accordance with the Canons.[56] It

[56] This was the Catholic demand down even to 1885. "They [the demands of Catholics] would be satisfied substantially by the establishment . . . of one or more Colleges conducted on purely Catholic principles." (Resolutions of the Catholic Hierarchy, Oct., 1885. See *Appendix to First Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 385.)

would be subjected to all the religious tests that the Canon Law provides—if even the full benefit of the Canons would be allowed.[57] That, I think, is what we always understood by a Catholic University— a University of the Louvain type. An odd heretic or two might be admitted to lecture, for a time, when a suitable Catholic could not be found; but the great body of the staff would be Catholic, and any one of them would be dismissed instantly in case he changed his religious opinions.

This old demand has been given up. The Robertson Commission—which reported in 1903, its recommendations being accepted more than once by the Catholic Bishops as providing a satisfactory settlement of the Catholic claim—recommended that all offices in the College should be open to persons of all denominations, subject only to the condition that the holders should not teach or publish anything contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. As to the observance of the condition in any given case, a Board of four Visitors—two being Catholic Bishops, the other two being judges, but not necessarily Catholics—should decide; the question of fact being for the entire Board, while that of law—what is opposed to the Church's teaching—would be for the Bishops only. This, though a departure from the earlier position taken up in Cardinal Cullen's time, was accepted officially more than once as a satisfactory settlement.[58]

Since the publication of the Report of the Robertson Commission, Mr. John Dillon, M. P., in a public lecture in Dublin, advocated the giving up of all claim to have any of the officials of the proposed new College or University subject to religious tests of

[57] In criminal cases,—which, before the Canon Law, comprise those in which one is accused of holding un-Catholic doctrine, and which alone would involve dismissal of a Professor for reasons known to the same Law,—there is even yet no canonical provision for properly conducted trials of the accused in the ecclesiastical courts of Ireland. In this and many other ways those who are kept very strictly to the observance of all the Canons, do not get the benefit of those which were made in their favour.

[58] See, for instance, a Statement drawn up by the Standing Committee of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, 25th July, 1906. It is published in the *Appendix to the First Report* of the Robertson Commission on Trinity College, p. 82.

any kind. This was almost quite in accordance with an official statement drawn up by the Hierarchy in June 1897, in which their Lordships say that "with some modifications in the Act [the Tests Act of 1873] in the sense of the English Acts of 1871, and the Oxford and Cambridge Act of 1877,[59] we have no objection to the opening up of the degrees, honours, and emoluments of the University to all comers."[60] The Statement does not necessarily mean that the Bishops would be satisfied even though there were no tests in the case of those who might "be entrusted with control, with charge of discipline or direction in the moral character of the students"; since Dr. O'Dwyer told the Robertson Commission in 1901 that he would expect the holders of such offices to be subject to tests. Later on, in 1904, the Bishops were consulted by the Chief Secretary, Mr. Wyndham, as to whether they would agree to have the "government" of the proposed new College, like that of Trinity College, "selected exclusively on academic grounds." Their answer was in the affirmative.[61] This looks like a resignation of all claim to religious tests as applying to any of the State-paid officials of the College.

It is on this basis of settlement that Mr. Birrell is now building; all offices in the new College to be open to members of all denominations, of religion or no religion, without dogmatic test of any kind whatsoever. The only guarantee which Catholics will get will be the appointment of the first Senate or Governing Body, most of whom, but not all, will be Catholics. They will be trusted to give the College a sufficiently Irish and Catholic trend, by appointing a goodly proportion of Irish and Catholic Fellows and other officials. The students, for the most part

[59] These modifications are set forth in the evidence given by the Bishop of Limerick, Dr. O'Dwyer, before the Robertson Commission. They regard the right to obtain and retain certain offices in the University which are legally tenable only by clergymen of the Church of England, as also the right and duty of the Governing Bodies of the Colleges to provide religious services and instruction for the students. See *Appendix to First Report* of the Robertson Commission, p. 28. *Ibid.*, nn. 384-7; 554-9; 574.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 388.

[61] See Letter of the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Walsh, published in the *Appendix to the Final Report* of the Robertson Commission on Trinity College, p. 42.

Catholic, to whom after some years the government of the College will pass, will be expected to maintain the advantage received by Catholics at the start, as Protestants do in Trinity College.

I note, moreover, that no part of the endowment given to the proposed new College by the State, may be spent in the maintenance of a Faculty of Divinity; though it will most probably be open to the Catholic Bishops to maintain such a Faculty in the College at their own expense. Whether they will do this is a question not of fact but of speculation. As far as I can read the signs of the times, they will not do it—as yet; till, perhaps, it may not be possible to do it at all; or, if they should do it, the members of the Faculty will be poorly paid, as compared with professors in other Faculties. On this aspect of the question the maintenance of a Faculty of Theology in the proposed new College, there have been as yet few indications of what is passing in the minds of the Bishops—if they have given the matter much consideration. They stated, as we have seen (p. 254), in what was practically a reply to the proposal for a reform of Trinity College, that it has been their hope that "sooner or later they should have a University, or at least a University College, in which they might maintain a Theological Faculty." Should the proposed new College come into being, they will have an opportunity of realizing that hope. There are indications, nevertheless, that they will be content for a time with a system of academic lectures, given by Professors from Maynooth or elsewhere.

I note, finally, that though the proposed new College is to have a State-endowed Faculty of Philosophy, including Ethics, even the Professors in this Faculty are to be subject to no tests; nor are the Catholic Bishops or their delegates to have any control over the teaching of the Faculty, except as outsiders, or in so far as any of them may be elected by the graduates to a seat on the Governing Body.

x. The Choice.

The reader has now before him, collected from a great mass of oral evidence, written statements, and other documents, all

the facts which I regard as being of primary importance to enable him to form a fairly prudent estimate of the relative merits of the two main proposals of reform. There are, of course, a multitude of other facts which it is practically impossible to set down on paper; many of them are not consciously present even to the closest students of the question when they come to decide, though the unconscious effect is considerable. There is no use in trying to catch and fix things of this kind; he who would appreciate them must have lived in Ireland—nay even in Trinity College; how else could he form a just estimate of the value, for instance, of the education which it gives or of the quality of its religious atmosphere? Should the reader not have lived here, and yet wish for more minute details than may be found in this article, he must only procure the two sets of Blue-books on which the Article is based throughout. If he is reasonable, he need not be told that Irishmen, Protestant and Catholic, are just like other men, except for the effect produced on them by the peculiar geographical position and history of their country, which are known to all.

The choice, then, which we have made—or have still to make—is not between, on the one hand, Trinity College such as it has been in the past and is now for the few Catholics who went or go there against the admonitions of their pastors; and, on the other, a Catholic University such as that of Louvain or Washington. It looks rather as if it were a choice between a mixed University of the Bonn type and a Secular college such as the State Universities of the Catholic countries of Europe.

It is not the present Trinity which we should have to choose, but rather the Trinity that we might reasonably hope to fashion. At present the College has an average, let us say, of 1,000 students, of whom 90 per cent. (900) are Protestants. If my estimate (p. 235) should be substantially correct, there are about 1,500 Catholic students in the Royal University. We might not be able to send all these to Trinity; but putting those whom we could send at 1,000; or taking Mgr. Molloy's estimate of 1,200, reaching up to 2,000 after a few years, with 100 Catholic students at present in Trinity and not reckoned by him; we should be able to send there from the first, if not a majority, at

least such a minority of the students as would be well able to defend themselves, safeguarded as they would be by the hereditary feud of race, which is not likely to die out, notwithstanding the mixture, till the garrison has been reduced to complete submission. As a centre of organization they would have a well-endowed Faculty of Theology with professors all subject to the Bishops, Catholic Professors of Philosophy and History almost equally subject, and a vigorous Gaelic League with a strong Catholic tendency. I know little of Irishmen if under these circumstances and conditions there would not soon be a great change in the Governing Body of the College. That is what I mean by the Trinity which we might reasonably hope to fashion—a Trinity of the Bonn type.

As against it we had—or have—it in our power to choose a University for Catholics wherein the great body of the Professors and other officials will be Catholics paid by the State and entirely independent of the Church as regards the retention of their offices. There will be no State endowment for a Faculty of Theology; and, as I read the signs of the times, there is little prospect of such a Faculty being established out of private funds. The Professors of History and Philosophy will be as independent of the Bishops as those of Mathematics; except in so far as, possibly, their Lordships may be able to persuade the Senate not to appoint men of suspected orthodoxy—a capacity which, no doubt, will be very real at first, but is only too liable to grow feeble unless in so far as a prudent and wholesome fear of belated ecclesiastical favour being shown to Trinity should keep the University for Catholics in order. That is what I call a State-endowed University for Catholics of the type known in so many European countries—and not regarded with special favour by the authorities of the Church.

To select this kind of University or University College is to hand over Trinity for all time—with its magnificent site, buildings, and income—as a further endowment to the (Protestant) Church of Ireland, already too richly endowed out of the funds of an impoverished nation, whilst, in addition, as the project is now taking shape under the hands of Mr. Birrell, the Queen's College in Belfast is to be made into an independent University

for the Presbyterians of the North, with a greatly increased annual grant from the pockets of the same poor people. These are facts, which should not be left out of the account. Whether we gain or lose by the choice we make, the Protestant garrison cannot but gain, by obtaining for their exclusive use two well-equipped and self-governing Universities; while we, with all our claims for equality of treatment, allow ourselves to be put off with a Federal University, made up in part of the reformed "godless" Colleges of Cork and Galway—though we proclaim it impossible to reform Trinity College;—a Federal University in which the new and best College will not be at all as well endowed as Trinity, while the other constituent bodies will be even more inferior to the self-governing and more highly endowed University of Belfast.

It remains only to add that those who favour one choice or the other agree in regarding it as possible, in course of time, to better the Catholic position. That it could and would be improved in Trinity I have little doubt; much less, any way, than I have that it will be improved with years in the (possible) rival institution; at least in case this is not possessed of a well-manned Faculty of Theology. It is by the saving influence of such a Faculty, working side by side with its sisters or fellows, as well equipped as they and with equal rank, independence, and university status generally,—it is only by influence of this kind that, especially in the absence of formal control on the part of the bishops, the Church of Ireland can hope to mould and safeguard the religious and philosophical teaching of whatever University we may join, whether that of Dublin or the Royal. We have refused an endowment for a Faculty of Theology in Trinity College; it would be a mistake irreparable if we failed to set up one—even though now it must be done at our own expense—in whatever new College may be given us.

xi. The Higher Education of the Clergy.

In warfare, I understand, a very difficult question sometimes arises, as to what had best be done with a fortress on which great sums were lavished; whether to keep it not only intact but in

touch with the main army; or to throw a garrison into it and leave it to defend itself; or to abandon it altogether. Many a campaign, we are told, was lost owing to a vain attempt to retain such a fortress; which does not prove, however, that in all cases fortresses should be dismantled.

In the education campaign that is now being conducted in Ireland, the Catholic General Staff are faced by a question of this kind with regard to Maynooth College, where the great majority of the diocesan clergy of the Irish Church make their higher studies. Shall we keep it on as it has been for more than a hundred years? or give it up altogether and take our chance in whatever new College or University may be founded? or try a compromise—join the University without giving up the College? This is one of the most serious—for churchmen the most serious—of the questions raised in the campaign.

It is easy to understand and it would be a hard heart that would not sympathise with the views of those—old or middle-aged men, for the most part, who were educated here, think there was and is no place in the world like it, and love every shrub in the grounds, every stone in the walls,—it would be hard not to sympathize with them when they say that it and it alone is the proper place of education for our ecclesiastical students, whether in Arts, or Philosophy, or Theology. The view is backed by the great authority of the Council of Trent, which would have youths aspiring to the priesthood segregated from their tender years, and trained for their holy calling in an atmosphere and under discipline entirely different from that in and under which young laymen may receive what would be for them a good Christian education. Whether the Tridentine arrangement was intended for all clergymen or only for the average has been disputed, as we know; whichever opinion may be right, history proves that the ordinary life of a University is not proper training for the priesthood; and that there should be specialisation of discipline as well as of study for a considerable time before the irrevocable vows are taken. At what time it would be well to begin to specialize is an open question; it is no wonder that experienced men, who have seen the stars fall from the heavens, should be convinced that the process could not begin too soon.

They would maintain the College of Maynooth as it is at present; would have the great body of the diocesan clergy of Ireland make therein their higher studies, as well in Arts as in Philosophy and Theology. If any new College or University that may be instituted can be got to recognize these studies as qualifying for degrees, all the better; let those who have studied here submit to any intellectual test that may be imposed. But let them be kept here for study and discipline, even though the lectures they attend should not be recognized as qualifying them even to present themselves for examination for degrees.

This position was taken up at a meeting of the Maynooth Union in June 1903, by the Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Healy, who said it was "the unanimous opinion of the Irish Bishops that Maynooth should be a constituent college of the new University, and that no other solution of the question could be regarded as satisfactory." Proceeding, he said: "We have no objection to see post-graduate courses taken by our past students in the Dublin University College. . . . I think, and all the Bishops think, that there ought to be a hospice established in connection with the new University in Dublin for this purpose. I think, too, an arrangement might be made by which some of the honour students here, needing a special training in a subject, for instance, like Physics, and needing special appliances, might be allowed to go to Dublin to attend a course of lectures. To that extent also I am prepared to go. I will not divide this College of Maynooth into two parts. This College of Maynooth for the past hundred years has been the pride and the bulwark of the Catholic Church in Ireland, and we are not going to split it up now or to weaken its classes here in the hope of getting university culture in Dublin that can be obtained in Maynooth." [62]

The hope of the Bishops—that Maynooth may be recognized as a Constituent College of any University that may be founded,—is not so strong as it then was; and it remains to be seen whether their resolutions—to keep the College intact—may not be proportionately weakened. Some of us would regard it as a cal-

[62] *Record of the Maynooth Union*, 1902-3, pp. 26-7.

amity in any case to have the candidates for priesthood deprived, by being kept here, of the advantage not only of the teaching but to a certain extent of the life of the University; in which, as the best men may be supposed to occupy the better-endowed chairs, and as other advantages in the shape of Museums, Laboratories, etc., will abound, the teaching at least, may be reasonably presumed to be of a superior quality. What is worse, Professors who lecture here, to prepare students for examination in Dublin, will always be tempted to become "grinders" rather than teachers—the bane of our Intermediate and of much of our University education at present. But if, as is not unlikely, attendance at lectures here is not to be recognized as qualifying the students even to go up for degrees, what character for education will the priests of the future hold as compared to laymen of the professional classes?

Not that University studies or degrees are of much value, as compared with such evidence of scholarship as may be given by published work; but that it is only in and through Universities the qualities that make for scholarship, however evidenced, can be obtained. It will be a kind of miracle if Maynooth does not lag behind, should it continue as it has been—cut off from any real participation in University life. I do not doubt that the average product of our Art schools, not to mention those of Philosophy and Theology, is of as high a quality as, if not even higher than, that of any Irish or English University; but I do not think our best men are as good—in Arts; and it is by what is best in it, much more than by its average, that the thought of a school tends to become the thought of the age.

So much for Arts. Coming now to Philosophy and Theology, I am deeply convinced—and the conviction grows deeper with age and experience—that both these sciences are terribly hampered when deprived of the handmaids that should minister to them. I am well aware of the modern tendency among students of the other sciences, to resent this claim to domination, as they deem it, on the part of Theology; but I would ask them to give theologians the credit of urging the claim for their science rather than for themselves. And what do we find? That scarcely any chemist, physicist, astronomer, biologist, archæologist, historian,

philologist, critic, or litterateur, worthy of the name, can be mentioned, who did not end by applying his conclusions to Theology. Were Kelvin, or Darwin, or Huxley, or Spencer, or Taine, or Littré, or Renan, or Harnack, or Mommsen,—not to go through the whole list—were they all made slaves because they could not help becoming theologians? True, they were not content to supply the materials to others better trained than they in this special department. But even so, in avoiding that personal indignity—if so they deemed it—they could not save their respective sciences from ministering to theology as represented by themselves.

If there has been a tendency among students of other branches of science to resent the claim made by Theology to press into her service the results they have achieved, there has been, I fear, only too often, a reverse tendency, among theologians, to make light of and neglect the ministrations of the handmaids. No wonder that so many of our arguments and illustrations should be weak and our conclusions distorted, based as they are on false Chemistry, Physics, Astronomy, Archæology, History, Criticism, and so on. For Theology is not faith, but a science; with one foot on God's Word, while the other rests on man's testimony and on nature. He who would be a philosopher must study nature constantly—must make all the use he can of the ascertained conclusions of all the physical sciences; and he who would be a theologian must be a historian as well as a philosopher. And as it is not given to any one man to be all these, we can only say that a school of Philosophy and Theology that is out of touch with those of Science and History, is standing on one leg—a position not of stable equilibrium. That is the danger to which we are exposed at Maynooth.

It may be asked why we should not hope to have such intercourse with the University as would keep us abreast of the times. I do not know, if it be not that we are at the wrong side of Dublin; or it may be that there is about seminaries an exclusiveness which frightens off and chills the laity. Whatever may have been the cause, there has been very little intercourse in my time between the staff here and those who have been engaged in any form of scientific or historical research in Dublin; and,

candidly, I do not hope for much improvement in this respect—as long as we stay here. With a new tendency among the best men, even of the clergy, to seek a field of labour and higher earthly rewards in the University rather than here, in Arts and Philosophy rather than Theology, the prospects of the Queen of Sciences are not all rosy—in Ireland.

What will be the effect of this on the University? The men—especially those in the Faculty of Philosophy and the students of History—will have no theological school to criticize and steady them; at least they will not be in living touch with any, which is what is wanted; and there is but too much reason to fear that the result will be what it has been wherever the same experiment has been tried.

I think I love this College as much as most of its children. I have spent more years in it than any other living man save one; I have never had the least desire to leave it; it has been and is to me almost an ideal home. Situated though it is in the midst of an uninteresting plain, and poor and rough as its life may be, it is a life of freedom and independence, and offers great facilities for study; all of which I value more than anything else after life and the grace of God.

Maynooth, however, is not mere stone walls; it is the men that make it, and the traditions, and the spirit. We could not carry the walls with us as Aeneas could not carry those of Troy; but we could have the same men, the same spirit, the same traditions; we could build up a new Maynooth, which, like the new Troy, might be destined for a wider empire.[63]

Moscow was hoary with age and venerable for its traditions; yet the Russians, who loved and reverenced it so, burnt it to save the country and itself. And they did save both. At a later date their grandsons were called on to abandon a newer and less venerable fortress, and they did not; therein failing in true service to their country.

[63] All lectures, whether in Trinity College or any new College or University that may be founded, are and will be open to all students, wherever they reside. Ecclesiastical students could have their own hospice, as Dr. Healy suggests, with regular seminary life, without forfeiting the right of attending lectures at the University.

I do not say or believe that we are called on to give up Maynooth altogether; but I do feel it a mighty responsibility that those are taking who are leaving this new College or University for Catholics without a Church-directed Faculty of Theology to steady it; leaving it to shift for itself as best it can with little more than the external guidance supplied by parochial churches —a weekly lecture or two in Apologetics and Ecclesiastical History, and a Faculty of Kantian, Hegelian, or the latest brand of Philosophy.

WALTER MACDONALD.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE,
MAYNOOTH.

THE NEW PHILOSOPHY IN FRANCE.[1]

II. The Principles of Psychology.

We have set forth in a former article what the New Philosophy considers to be the subject matter, the method and the value of Philosophy, that is to say, we have exposed its principles of metaphysics,—metaphysics and philosophy being ultimately identical. In order to give the full presentation of the system necessary for the formation of a judgment regarding this school, it will be necessary to state its principles of psychology. For in this school not only does psychology serve as an introduction to metaphysics, and furnish the elements with which metaphysics is constructed, but metaphysics is indeed the result of the fullest and deepest application of psychology to reality and the true psychology necessarily ends in metaphysics.

Especially since the time of Locke and Hume, psychology and epistemology have been considered as sciences distinct from metaphysics; the former as the science of internal facts, the latter as the science of the value of knowledge. These two sciences have been, to a great extent, the field of study for the philosophical mind in the nineteenth century. While Kant in Germany devoted his energies to the critical problem, followed in this direction by Hamilton in Scotland, the Scottish School under the influence of Reid and Dugald Stewart emphasized the conception of psychology as a distinct science and insisted upon the internal observation and reflection as its proper method. The Eclectic School in France was nothing more than a branch of the Scottish School, while in England Stuart Mill applied the method of analysis already inaugurated by Hume and developed the theory of associationism.

It was then generally acknowledged that psychology is a science independent of metaphysics, that it is the science of internal phenomena. Under the influence of Auguste Comte,

[1] Cf. *The Catholic University Bulletin*, April, 1906.

the conception of science became more strictly defined; it implied the use of a precise method. By the psychologists of the Scottish and Eclectic Schools psychology had been studied by means of internal observation only; it had been rather descriptive. Stuart Mill himself with more subtlety of analysis had not gone much beyond the data of common sense. Auguste Comte denied the value of introspection, and others, while accepting its legitimacy, found it too vague to furnish the basis of a truly scientific study.

At that time natural sciences, physics and physiology were making great progress; physicists and physiologists were confronted by the problems of psychology; they did not hesitate to study them. John Muller enunciated the law of the specification of the nerves, and what is more notable, he with other physiologists, called attention to the close connection existing between psychological phenomena and their physiological causes or effects and consequently between psychological phenomena and their physical conditions and results. The study of this connection seemed to make it possible to arrive not only at a descriptive, but even at an explanatory knowledge of the facts of consciousness. We may now not only observe them, but through their physiological and physical conditions we are able to experiment on them. Psychology, as an experimental science, is possible.

The first students of the new science, most of them physicists and physiologists of great renown, such as Dubois-Raymond, Helmholtz, Donder, Exner and others, in the study of physiological phenomena, took the physical conditions as the chief basis of their explanation and attempted to measure both the duration and the intensity of psychical facts. Weber enunciated his famous "logarithmic law" of the relations between the physical stimulus and the sensation, which was perfected by Fechner and later by Delbœuf and Sergi. This constitutes in experimental psychology the psycho-physical tendency. I say tendency rather than school or period, for although giving the first place in their explanations to the physical conditions, they give not a little importance to the physiological factors.

With Wundt and his disciples physiological conditions took

the first place; this forms the psycho-physiological tendency. Wundt has had considerable influence on the development of experimental psychology. He founded at Leipzig a pyschological laboratory and developed there many students, who, afterwards, founded on the model of Leipzig, laboratories in which there was shown a great activity, especially in Germany and in America. Lately the scientific observation of abnormal facts has opened in experimental psychology a new field known as abnormal or pathological psychology,—a field especially cultivated in Germany and France by Charcot, Bernheim, Kroepelin, Pierre Janet and others.

It is not our intention to give here the results obtained by experimental psychology; they have already been indicated in this Review.[2] Our aim has been simply to note the progress and development of this school as representing divers phases in the general evolution of psychology,—with a view of determining exactly what position the New Philosophy takes in the conception of that science.

Nobody will deny the importance of the results obtained by psycho-physics and psycho-physiology, as well as the fundamental improvement which they have wrought in psychological methods. Psycho-physics and psycho-physiology will endure as a necessary element of a scientific psychology. Their results make it clear that psychological facts cannot be adequately studied without regard to their physical and physiological elements and that laboratories of psychology,—even though they are not exactly to psychology what laboratories of physics and chemistry are to those particular sciences,—are indispensable to a scientific study of certain elements of psychology. They have introduced into psychology more precision by their application of scientific methods. To deny their importance would be to ignore one of the most important periods in the evolution of psychology; to refuse them a place in psychology would be to condemn psychology to remain to a certain extent a de-

[2] Cf. "The New Psychology," by C. A. Dubray. *The Catholic University Bulletin*, January, 1907.

scriptive knowledge, often inprecise and incomplete even as a descriptive knowledge.

It must be well remarked that the New Philosophy does not deny the necessity of such researches and methods; it does not deny the value of such results. It appreciates psycho-physics and psycho-physiology in that they furnish the psychologist with some elements necessary to arrive at a positive and relatively adequate knowledge of psychological facts,—that is, in so far as the human mind can have an adequate knowledge of things; but it maintains that these sciences themselves are unable to arrive at this definitive knowledge; that they do not afford a truly adequate method of psychology. Keeping these necessary observations in mind, we shall expose the criticism of psycho-physics and psycho-physiology, as made by the New Philosophy and then the psychological method as understood by this New Philosophy.

In our exposition we follow the works already quoted of Prof. Bergson, the leader of this school, and especially his works entitled "Essai sur les donées immédiates de la conscience," [3] and "Matière et mémoire."

Psychology is a knowledge of facts, the knowledge of the facts of consciousness. Its true method must be therefore, as for any other study of facts, the method of observation. How may the observation of the facts of consciousness be positive and adequate? In this lies the whole question.

The object of a truly real and positive knowledge is to put us in contact, as close as possible with facts and beings, with their elements and activity. The task, therefore, of the psychologist is to apply to the facts of consciousness the processes which will enable him to reach this end. How may these processes be applied to the psychological facts? As is evident, we must start from internal observation or introspection; facts of consciousness as such are present to us or exist for us only through introspection. Nobody denies, or has ever denied, that this is the necessary starting point. No true

[3] Our readers will not fail to notice the points of similarity between the principles of Prof. Bergson and those of Prof. W. James.

psychology is possible without introspection. But how can internal observation or introspection be exact and precise except by being conducted in a scientific way? And, how are we to apply to it the process necessary to an exact study in any science of facts, namely, the processes of experiment and calculation? It seems that only one way is possible, and that is to study the internal facts through their physical conditions or through the physiological phenomena which are connected with them; in this way internal facts can be studied scientifically. Such has been the conception taken and the course followed by the psycho-physical and psycho-physiological schools.

To consider as equal all the differences of sensation corresponding to the least perceptible increase of physical stimulus, and to consider each sensation as the sum of all the differences of sensations which have preceded it from the zero of sensation—such is the postulate of psycho-physics. Then we have in the world of consciousness, a basic unit, a principle of equality, of addition and of difference. Psychology is able to attain to a scientific precision; its laws can be formulated even in mathematical propositions. Such is the case, for instance, with the logarithmic law of Weber and Fechner: the sensation is proportional to the logarithm of the stimulus, $S = C \log E$; S standing for the sensation, E for the stimulus with its numerical quantity, C for the constant which has to be determined for each special class of sensation.

Now the New Philosophy maintains that principles or laws of this character are principles or solutions of mathematics and physics, but not solutions of psychology. In order to assert the principle stated above, the psycho-physicists begin by eliminating from its concepts and ignoring everything that is properly psychological. What is done? I perceive that to a certain stimulus, E, there corresponds a certain sensation, for instance, a sensation of sound, S. I increase the stimulus in a continuous and gradual way and at a certain moment, E^1, I perceive in my consciousness the sensation of sound S^1. It is evident that I can measure the difference which exists between the two stimuli; they are of the same nature and the one is nothing but a real, quantitative, and therefore measur-

able augmentation of the other. There is between the two extreme stimuli E and E^1 a continuous and quantitative series of intermediate stimuli which I can number. But am I able to do the same for S and S^1 and for what exists between them? I cannot, and why? Because in reality S^1 is not S plus a certain quantity of the same kind of sensation. S^1 is to my consciousness something altogether different from S. My consciousness perceives between S and S^1 not a numerical or a quantitative difference, but a psychological difference, a difference of nature and quality. Moreover my consciousness, in order to perceive between S and S^1 a difference, in order to perceive one as an addition made to the other, ought to be able to perceive the gradual and continuous passage from S to S^1. But no perception of that kind exists in my consciousness. To my consciousness S^1 is another state, or a phenomenon distinct in nature from S itself. My consciousness cannot consider the one as a unit in relation to the other, or as a multiplication of the other. What does the psycho-physicist do? He likens the phenomena of consciousness S. and S^1 to the corresponding physical phenomena E and E^1. These are measurable, being quantitative and quantities of the same nature; thus he concludes the conscious facts, through and in their physical phenomena, become subject to experiment and calculation. But in reality only physical phenomena have been or could be measured.[4] We do indeed speak commonly, Prof. Bergson says, of deeper emotions, of greater sensations, of higher and lower tones, of lights more or less bright, of stronger efforts; we compare our diverse states or phenomena of consciousness and we express them in terms of quantity and extension. But, in reality, if we examine more closely, we shall see clearly that the quantitative element is not in the conscious fact as seen by internal observation,—from this most direct source, each phenomena presents a distinctly qualitative and specific character,—but in its conditions and effects in our body, and thence in its oral expression. We

[4] Cf. Bergson: *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*, pp. 45-54.

do not express our states of consciousness directly but through their physical and physiological conditions and results. The reason is because language, based on common observation, tends always to the expression of what is clearer, more easily and more usefully represented. The physical and physiological phenomena being exterior and sensible, and being the more practically interesting and useful, are also more easily and more usefully expressed than the interior phenomena. Hence we express the latter by the former. The very expressions are proof that such is the process. What we call a high or a low tone is a sound which demands a certain effort or attitude of the whole body, especially of the head in the sense of height or depth, the use of the high or of the low parts of the throat,—it is in this sense that we speak of a head note, of a deep voice. In reality, however, each sound appears to consciousness, which observes it directly, as qualitatively different from all others. The same must be said of our sensations of light. It is true that we speak of certain surfaces as being more or less blue, more or less white, etc., it is true that we even measure the degrees of color through a photometer. But here our judgment is based not on the sensation itself, but on its physical causes or conditions. We know by experience the divers quantitative changes of these physical conditions corresponding to the changes of our sensations; by experiment we measure the degrees of quantity in these conditions corresponding to the diversity in sensations, and we transfer these quantitative differences and measures to the diversity of sensations. For instance, in the photometric experiments, the psycho-physicist observes that a candle placed at a certain distance gives a certain sensation of light; he observes also that if he doubles the distance, he must then use, not two, but four candles in order to obtain the same sensation. Thence he concludes that had he doubled the distance of the single candle there would have been only one fourth as much light as at first. This is evidently true of the physical effect of light and expresses the exact relations which exist between two luminous sources, the one four times greater than the other, but twice farther away than the other. But it does not measure in any way the

psychological effect of light or the sensation itself, which has served only as a means of measurement between the two physical quantities and is in no way included in the result. Yet the measurement of the one is transferred to the other and we speak of a sensation of light one, two or three times greater than another.[5]

In consequence of some experiments, physiology itself is inclined to observe a difference of nature between the sensation of heat and the sensation of cold; but a direct observation of these sensations shows that there is a difference of nature even between the diverse sensations of heat and the diverse sensations of cold; our conceptions of a mere diversity of degrees in these sensations, and of their measurement are based on our knowledge of the diverse quantities of their sources or on the extension of their influence on the organs of our bodies. The same must be said of sensations of contact, touch or weight. When we say that one pain is greater than another, that a pain increases or diminishes, it is not really the pain itself as presented to our consciousness that we express, nor are the different degrees expressed really different degrees of the pain itself. What we express, compare and measure is the number or the extension of the bodily parts which are affected or the number and force of the reactions which it provokes. When we speak of a stronger inclination, of a greater effort, of a preferred pleasure, or of an unbearable pain, we evidently imply and express the presence of an element of quantity capable of being measured and actually measured. But this element of quantity, this object of measure, is not the psychological facts themselves. What is really measured here is the movement which naturally accompanies, or necessarily results from those diverse states of consciousness, in order to realize them; a movement which has already begun and is delineated in our organs, even before it has been consciously decided upon and performed.

The same careful observation applied to each and every one of our conscious states, sensation, feeling, attention, decision, and so forth, would lead us to the same conclusion.

[5] Cf. Bergson: *Essai sur les données . . .*, pp. 40-44.

Hence it is, according to Prof. Bergson, that a methodic and complete reflexion shows that there is no real intensity, increase or quantity in our diverse states of consciousness and consequently there are no degrees. Each one of them has its own specific quality and nature; each one of them is a species by itself. The error of the psycho-physicists and also of the psycho-physiologists, who practically accept the same principles, is that they have considered primarily in the psychological facts their physical and physiological conditions and effects. They have unconsciously identified these conditions and effects with the pyschological facts themselves. Thus they have been led to treat psychology as a part of physics and physiology and to apply to it the methods proper to those sciences. They have been physicists and physiologists rather than psychologists. They have indeed furnished the psychologist with many important observations and necessary elements of investigation, since there is a close connection between these different aspects and studies, but they do not furnish an adequate method of psychological knowledge. So much for the intensity and nature of the psychological facts.

Another important element of the psychological facts is their character of multiplicity and duration. Here again Prof. Bergson maintains that the psycho-physical and psycho-physiological theories and methods have failed to assign the true essence of these elements as related to psychological facts. We have already stated in a former article the metaphysical theory of these notions, as formulated by the New Philosophy. Here we have only to expose briefly their psychological character as it is understood by this school. Number, says Prof. Bergson, implies both unity and multiplicity; it is a collection of identical units. Moreover it essentially implies distinction and juxtaposition of the diverse units of the collection. Now the idea of juxtaposition and consequently the idea of number is possible only through the conception of space. For it supposes not only that there is a succession of events or things numbered, but also that each one of these things or events exists permanently and simultaneously, though individually distinct,

until the last is added; then the number is formed. This analysis shows that the idea of number or numerical quantity and consequently the idea of measurement is necessarily built with parts of space and in space. Now, as the most practical way for us to see things and events and to compare them is to consider them as distinct and as placed side by side, and to measure them, that is, to consider them under the form of numerical quantities, it has happened that this notion of space has invaded all our mental processes and conceptions. We have come to see all things and events in relation with space,—material objects in relation with the real space which they occupy, and other objects and events in relation with an ideal and symbolical space in which we establish them. The common and even scientific conception of time and duration has been formed with space, in order to render them an object of numeration and measure, which are the best conditions of practical use and easy management of things. We conceive space as an homogeneous and indefinite vacuum in which we situate all the heterogeneous realities; in like manner we conceive time as an homogeneous vacuum in which we situate all the diverse events. The difference between space and time consists in this character that space is considered as an order of co-existent realities, time as a reversible order of successive events. Philosophers have discussed the problem of the relations between space and time and the possibility of reducing one to the other; but it is clear that such a conception of time is simply an aspect of the conception of space; it is made up of the elements of space. All attempts like that made by the English School to reduce space to time turns into a vicious circle. In fact, an order of events supposes that these events are multiple and distinct in their multiplicity, that they occupy separate places and exist simultaneously, that is, they are conceived as placed side by side. In this conception succession or time is built up with simultaneity, with space. In this notion of time, the essential elements are multiplicity, distinction and reversible simultaneity; there is no place for the specific character of each event. Time then is homogeneous. Such being the case, it is evident that time must be a quantity;

it can be measured; its diverse moments can be numbered. But what is numbered or measured in it is precisely the elements of space with which it has been constructed. The diverse moments are nothing more than the diverse portions of space. In this motion and its quantitative elements there is no trace of duration proper. That such is the case can be easily seen by observing how we speak of time and movement and of their measurement. When I consider on a clock the movement of a hand corresponding to the oscillations of the pendulum I do not measure the duration; I only count simultaneities. In the outside world, at any moment, there is only one present position of the hand. In my consciousness there is a mental penetration, without distinction, of the conscious states which are produced by the diverse positions of the hand. In none of them, taken apart, do we find any character of homogeneity or juxtaposition, the essential elements of measure and number; but there appears a mental construction inspired by our instinct of using and representing these conscious states in the most practical way—that is, by way of number and measure. Outside of my consciousness there is mutual exteriosity of positions without succession; in my consciousness there is succession of organizations of the conscious states without mutual exteriosity. As these successive organizations correspond, one by one, to the diverse oscillations of the pendulum, which are clearly distinct from each other, I decompose my conscious life according to these distinct oscillations; I conceive it as formed of distinct moments exterios and added to each other. On the other side, I project my conscious remembrance on the pendulum; then the diverse positions of the hand are considered as preserved; the past ones are connected together and with the present by way of juxtaposition. I obtain thence an idea of time which is numerable and measureable; but this idea of time is nothing more than a fourth dimension of space.

The case is the same for movement, Prof. Bergson says. What we measure in it is not movement proper or mobility, which is the essence of movement, but the part of space traversed by that movement. Movement is a progress; it consists essentially in an act of passing from one position to another. What we measure is the diverse positions occupied

in space. But here again we combine together the act of mobility with the positions of space. We attribute to the movement itself the divisibility which belongs to space, and we project into space the act of moving; we apply this moving action by a sort of solidification, along the line which is traced through space. By so doing we arrive at this strange affirmation that progress can be located, that, even outside of consciousness, the past coexists with the present. It is precisely this confusion which lies at the bottom of the sophisms of the Eclectic School.[6]

In reality all the sciences which have for an object the measure of movement never measure time or movement in its specific character; nay, more, they purposely exclude from their definitions and principles the elements of mobility and duration which are the very essence of movement and time, and they base all their reasonings and calculations on simultaneities in space.[7]

This conception of time does not give a true representation of reality. In its application, however, to physical phenomena which are by their nature in relation with extension and space, it is sufficiently correct in order to apply them to practical purposes.

It is the same notion of time which is applied to the psychological phenomena, when one speaks of their multiplicity, duration and measurement. But in this case it is bound to fail by the very nature of the object itself. The psychological phenomena are not made up of separate elements each one complete in itself; they are not merely placed side by side and they do not form a quantitative multitude by being added one to the other, as the case may be supposed with mechanical phenomena. The psychological phenomena are living phenomena whose make-up is not quantity, but complexity. They are formed not by addition or difference, but by combination and organization. They are complex phenomena in which each part is an element neither separated nor separable from the other elementary parts, but an integrating element which does not exist except by and

[6] Bergson: *Essai . . .*, pp. 77-86.

[7] Cf. Former article, *Catholic University Bulletin*, April, 1906.

in relation to the whole, as the members of a body. All together they form not a quantity but a whole. This stimulus can produce this sound, that stimulus another sound, but where diverse stimuli, capable, when taken each one by itself, of producing diverse sensations, are acting together, they produce a sound which is not a mere addition of diverse sounds; they produce a single sound in which all the possible sounds have been absorbed and organized in an indivisible whole. Rhythm in music does not consist in the comparison of successive sounds, but in the fusion of sounds. In a word, physical phenomena can be considered as numerical quantities; psychological phenomena are essentially qualitative organizations. Physical phenomena can be measured, psychological phenomena cannot be measured; they are appreciated.

Multiplicity in the world of consciousness, in its proper character, must not be confused with numerical multiplicity. It is not a quantitative but a qualitative multiplicity, it is not a multiplicity of addition, but a multiplicity of organization. Its diverse elements do not form a collection or a number, but an organization or a whole. I can count the number of words or notes in a speech or a piece of music; the sum of these is the same for every body. It is the same whether I hear or read them; this is a physical consideration and I obtain a quantitative multiplicity. But I cannot count the feelings or combinations of feelings which have invaded my consciousness when I hear these words or music. They have been multiple, however, they are different for each hearer; this is a psychological consideration, and I obtain a qualitative multiplicity. When I go to sleep under the influence of some noise or movement regularly repeated, it is not the last sound as such, nor even its mere addition to the preceding sounds which produces the effect; but this sound forms with the preceding ones a certain combination, a rhythmic organization of a certain quality which invites me to sleep. The same is true of symphony in music, as it is true of any continuous noises in the diverse impressions which they produce. This explanation seems, indeed, to be in contradiction with our way of speaking, but we must remember that, in his formation of language, man had in view not so much the

adequate exactitude as the practical use of the representation and expression of reality. Therefore the conception of space has been predominant; our language is a spatial language.

In the same way, duration, as commonly conceived, is a succession where each event is exterior and united to another by juxtaposition. This so-called duration is a mere division of space. Such a duration is the same for all beings and for all sorts of events and impressions. In such a conception of duration, each event has the same value; each event is considered as complete in itself and is measured according to a standard which is the same for all. There is no difference between the first and the last stroke of a pendulum, between any two full notes in a piece of music. This duration is pure quantity, its events are measured and diversified simply by their quantity. The real duration as given in consciousness, on the contrary, is a succession of events and impressions which penetrate each other and all together form an organization always more and more complex. It is not therefore a succession by addition or juxtaposition; it is a succession by assimilation and progress. The different phases of these organizations are not different by their quantity, but by the quality and specific character which they present. Duration, then, varies in each being, with every event, according to its quality, place, or part in the organization. The real duration is not quantity, it is not numbered; it is quality and rhythm; it is appreciated.

So it happens, Prof. Bergson continues, that we find two different aspects in our Ego. The one is formed and constructed through the ideas of quantitative multiplicity, intensity, and of homogeneous duration, based on our conception of space. Each psychological event and fact is distinct from and exterior to the others, expressible and fixed in as many different words. As it is the less personal and the more superficial, it is the most practical and the most favorable to social intercourse, this consideration of the Ego has become to be a common one. It is in relation with it that the diverse problems, even of philosophy, are proposed and solved. And this is the very cause why these problems are involved with contradictions, why their solutions are always confronted with insoluble objec-

tions. The real Ego, on the contrary, the Ego which is pure quality and pure duration, which is essentially living, essentially personal, the Ego in which there is no isolated element but only complex organizations, no distinct movement but only stages of development of the whole personality, is forgotten; and yet, in order to expose the philosophical problems in their true light, in order to find their definitive solution it is absolutely necessary to come back to it; it is necessary to substitute this concrete Ego for what is only its symbolical representation. Professor Bergson illustrates at length these affirmations by the study of two of the most fundamental problems of philosophy, the problem of freedom and the problem of the relations between body and mind as manifested through perception and memory.[8]

We need not follow him on these special points. It merely remains for us to state what the true method of psychology is according to the New Philosophy and how we are able to acquire a true and real knowledge of psychological phenomena. All that precedes must have already acquainted the reader with this method; we have only to summarize it in some more definite propositions and examples.

Psychology, as we have seen, studies the facts of consciousness. To explain them rightly we must perceive them in their very reality, as facts of consciousness. The essential condition which must direct and dominate our method here, as in any positive study, is adaptation and subjection to the facts. Psychological facts are perceived directly in their true reality only by internal observation. Every one admits this proposition, and yet when it comes to studying these facts in a positive way, internal observation is more or less put aside, and the method adapted to physical or physiological phenomena is imposed on them. The physical facts being perceived as such only by internal observation, they will be studied, in a positive way, as psychical only through a reflexive use of internal observation. In what will this reflexive use of internal observation consist? Essentially in putting ourselves, our mind, our whole

[8] The first of these problems is studied in Chap. III, of *Essai sur les données . . .*, the second in "*Matière et mémoire.*"

faculty of knowledge and feeling, through its power of flexibility and adaptability, in intimate contact with the psychical fact, in entering into it, in living it; and what is that but reflexion itself applied to psychology? If we pay attention, we can remark that, at bottom, every perception, every reflexive act of knowledge consists in a tendency or an attempt to be the very object, to realize the action known. Do we not commonly say that in order to know a thing we have to realize it fully, and is not all our study of its characters and circumstances a preparation to penetrate and realize it?

In the psycho-physical and psycho-physiological methods internal observation is only a starting point. It only furnishes the matter on which we have to work. The fact is analyzed in its elements and it is supposed to be truly known, scientifically as it is said, when, with these elements studied separately, we have constructed them into a synthesis which is supposed to be the real fact. In reality a scheme has been built which is an artificial representation of the fact, as a motionless line of a certain length represents a certain movement, as a figure represents a being, a portrait, a person. We have only a substitute of the fact; the very fact itself is not perceived in its reality. In its process, according to the New Philosophy, the internal observation remains always the very centre of the method. And as the act of vision or of hearing to which the attention is applied remains always essentially an act of vision or of hearing, the internal observation to which the reflexion is applied always remains an internal observation, a lived internal observation, what Professor Bergson calls an intuition. As is the case with every reflective act, this act calls for effort, a very special effort, since reflexion must always adapt itself to the peculiar character of the object which is studied, and here the object is a very peculiar one, an internal act.

Let us take an example. In psychology, as the New Philosophy conceives it, examples are necessary, and they must take the character of suggestions rather than that of external illustrations. They must be suggestive of the act or impression which every one is invited to realize or feel in himself, since the facts of consciousness cannot be perceived but by conscious-

ness itself. Let us take the esthetic feeling. We call "graceful" those movements which are produced with a certain amplitude which are bound together and develop one into another. Hence we say that a curve is more graceful than a broken line. Again, we call "graceful," those movements which obey a certain rhythm, as in music for instance, or in architecture. In what does our feeling consist in this case? The psycho-physicist will explain it by measuring the diverse moments of the rhythm or the diverse proportions of the elements. He will have given a mathematical or a physical solution. The psycho-physiologist will examine the diverse organic elements, muscular and others, interested in the action and the impression and will conclude perhaps with Herbert Spencer that it corresponds to an economy of effort.[9] He will have given a physiological solution. Let us examine this feeling according to the method proposed by the New Philosophy. Let us enter into these movements or into these lines themselves. Let us move in them and with them and we shall succeed in realizing and living the very feeling which they provoke in us. We will remark that the pleasure of broad movement arises from a greater fullness of life which it gives to our nature; that by its continuous and round form, it allows us to enclose, to guess, and to foresee in each present movement the following movement with its direction; it allows us to envelope the future in the present. By its rhythm it gives us the impression that we dominate the whole movement itself, that we produce it ourselves; in a word, it allows our life to expand and extend itself. It expresses our own life in itself and develops it with itself. If we go deeper into the esthetic impression we shall see that there is a sort of sympathy between the objects and our nature, between the movements and our life itself, and this is the very essence of the esthetic feeling.

This is only an example. Similar ones could be adduced from the field of every kind of sensation or emotion, ideas or sentiment.[10] But this is sufficient to render clear what the

[9] Cf. H. Spencer: *Essay on Progress.*

[10] Bergson, *Essai sur les données, etc.* Chap. I.

method is, which the New Philosophy believes to be the true method of psychology.

Let us say before concluding what the New Philosophy, if we interpret it rightly, considers to be the importance and the necessary place of analysis and abstraction, of the psycho-physical and psycho-physiological processes, of the experiments of laboratories, inquiries, etc., in psychology. Their role is not to give definitive results and solutions; they are unable to give them. They prepare for them; they are only auxiliary processes, though necessary auxiliaries. The better I know the diverse elements, physical or physiological, interested in psychical phenomena, the better also and the more fully shall I be able to enter into them by reflexion, to realize them, to know them in themselves. They are, moreover, the necessary instruments for the expression of these results and their transmission through language.

On these conditions and by this method, according to the New Philosophy, will psychology be, not a mathematical, not a physical nor even a physiological psychology, but a psychological psychology, that is, a true and positive psychology.

We have exposed as faithfully and as exactly as possible the principles of the New Philosophy, after a sincere effort to penetrate into it and to realize it. If we now summarize the fundamental characteristics which constitute the originality of the New Philosophy, we shall remark that they consist: 1st, in a theory of the relative and practical value of science; 2nd, in a special conception of the relations between science and philosophy and of the nature of their respective objects; 3rd, in a theory of intuition—intuition being considered as the necessary and fundamental method in any philosophical inquiry, and implying the primacy of action over the primacy of thought. We have also remarked, and the remark had been made by Schiller himself,[11] that there is a certain relation between the New Philosophy and Pragmatism. As a matter of fact, some disciples of Prof. Bergson have maintained on diverse problems pragmatic solutions.

[11] *Mind*, October, 1904.

Reserving, however, for a special study the question of Pragmatism, we shall examine,—from the point of view of Scholastic Philosophy, which is ours,—these theories of Relativity of Science, of Relation of Science and Philosophy, of Intuition, and attempt to determine the value of the New Philosophy.

George M. Sauvage, *C. S. C.*

Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C.

(*To be Continued.*)

NOTES ON EDUCATION.

The Teaching of Religion.

Of the many problems which confront the student of education in the United States today none is more conspicuous than that which divides education into two systems. In the same street one sees the public school and the parochial school. In the same city non-sectarian colleges are rivalled by colleges under denominational control. Among the universities of the world a goodly number still adhere to some form of religious belief, while a still larger number are indifferent.

The consequences are generally known. The State employs thousands of teachers and the Church does her educational work through a system of her own. Besides the expenditure of money raised by taxation there is the outlay of money from private sources. Frequently, too, there is friction, conflict or even repressive legislation—as is just now the case in France.

Whatever be the details of this struggle, its logical beginning is found in divergence of view regarding the purpose of education. Assume that the school is concerned with the present life only and that its chief function is to prepare for citizenship, and you will readily infer that education belongs to the State. But if we hold that education is both for this life and for the next life, religion must evidently have a place in the school and the Church must co-operate with the State.

Historically, this division can be traced to the sixteenth century. Those who set aside the authority of the Church in matters of faith changed also the educational system to suit their ideas of religion and morality. The State, especially in Germany and England, was quite willing to take the school under its control. The process of secularization went on more rapidly as positive belief disappeared. In our own country the earliest schools were established and conducted under the auspices of religion. Later on as the Republic grew politically and in-

dustrially and as religious bodies multiplied, the difficulties of securing co-operation of Church and State increased, so that now even those who realize the necessity of religious instruction are opposed to the teaching of religion in schools supported by public funds.

Meantime, the Catholic Church has continued her work of education in separate schools, not because she denies the right of the State to instruct its citizens, but because she regards the training of every man and woman in the truths of religion as a matter of paramount importance both for temporal and for eternal welfare.

Various attempts have been made to show that, on scientific grounds, religion should be excluded from the school. It has been said that the Church is opposed to science, that her method of teaching religion, i. e. by authority, is incompatible with the spirit of free investigation, and that the mind of the child is not able to seize upon religious truth in such a way as to make it a fruitful part of knowledge.

Over against these assertions are the facts that many of the greatest scientists, discoverers and men of letters have been loyal Catholics, educated in Catholic institutions and encouraged in their scientific work by the authorities of the Church.

But the core of this whole question is evidently psychological. Does the Church conform to the laws of mental life when she unites the teaching of religion with the teaching of other subjects? Does she observe these laws in the teaching of religion itself—in her worship and in the various practices which she enjoins? The answer is found in her liturgy through which she appeals to the senses; in her symbolism, which depends upon the association of ideas; in her insistence upon manifesting faith in action, and the honor which she bids us pay to the saintly men and women whose lives deserve imitation. Psychology is just beginning to study the mental laws which the Church, from her earliest days, has observed.

From the Catholic point of view there can be no doubt that the child who receives a religious education is better equipped for his future contact with the world than the child to whom no such education is given. For when religion is properly

taught it fixes in the mind certain beliefs that steady it in the midst of doubt and certain principles of conduct which guide and protect it in the midst of temptation. The adaptation to environment which religion inculcates is not a weak yielding to every influence, but rather a power of discriminating good from evil and of holding fast to the good.

Such power is especially needful for those who are to go from the school to institutions of a higher grade. In the college and university, where the most serious problems of life are freely discussed, the student must be well grounded in the teachings of religion if he is to avoid error and cling to truth. And the best safeguard of morality for him or her is perseverance in those religious practices which begin, or should begin, in the primary school.

This statement of the problem, written by Dr. Pace for the Third Lesson of The Psychology of Education, deserves the earnest consideration of all those who are laboring for the upbuilding of our Catholic school system, and particularly of all those who are charged with the important work of teaching religion. No earnest student of the problem can fail to notice the wide chasm which separates current methods of teaching catechism from the method of teaching religion which is embodied in the life of the Church, in her sacramental system, in her liturgy, in her worship and in the practices which she enjoins.

Moreover, no student of education can fail to recognize that there is a similar discrepancy between the current methods of teaching religion and the principles embodied in present methods of teaching the sciences. It is, indeed, this latter discrepancy which has led the casual observer outside the Church into the error of supposing that the teaching of religion is necessarily committed to methods that are essentially antagonistic to the spirit of educational progress as manifested in the teaching of other branches.

The cause of this state of affairs may easily be discovered in the history of the problem, but it would be difficult to find a justification for its continuance. There is no obvious reason why educational principles that have stood the test of science and of experience should be less rigorously adhered to in the

teaching of religion than in the teaching of any other subject. On the contrary, from the supreme importance which we attach to the teaching of religion in our schools, we should expect to find in the Christian Doctrine class the first fruits of every advance in the knowledge of fundamental principles.

Moreover, when it is shown that the educational principles in question are the very life-principles of the Church's organic activity, it is hard to understand why they should be set aside in the formal teaching of religion in our schools. This discrepancy between theory and practice does not spring from a lack of interest on the part of those who are responsible for the teaching of religion. That they are conscious of this discrepancy and that they are trying to remedy the defects in the present methods of teaching Christian Doctrine so as to bring them into harmony with recognized principles is evident from a rapidly growing literature on the subject.

Rev. Thomas Devlin, Superintendent of Parish Schools in the Diocese of Pittsburgh, in his Annual Report for 1906,[1] says: "The memorizing of the text of the Catechism, or Bible or Church History, is not sufficient for a religious education. Without explanation such an exercise is not even worthy of the name of instruction, which, though better than mere recitation, is also insufficient. Instruction enlightens the understanding. Of itself it does not reach the heart. To be effective the knowledge imparted must form the character. It must direct the conscience, influence the will, govern the conduct. To teach children their duties is important, but to teach them to love their duties and find happiness in fulfilling them is the aim and purpose of Christian education. . . . In this, as in all other branches, sound principles of teaching should not be ignored and the value of illustrations, examples, object lessons, and of natural methods in accordance with the philosophy of mind and its laws of development should receive due attention."

A similar thought is expressed by the Rev. James F. Nolan,

[1] Report of the School Board and the Superintendent of Parish Schools, 1906, Diocese of Pittsburgh, p. 9.

Superintendent of Parish Schools in the Archdiocese of Baltimore, in his Annual Report for 1907:[2]

"And yet those who have given serious consideration to the question assert that there is something radically wrong in our method of conducting catechism classes. We do not produce the results that we should. We are apt to rest content and feel gratified when the words of the text have been thoroughly committed to memory, forgetting that to teach children their religion means far more than merely to teach them their catechism. . . . Our catechism is quite defective in the few moral lessons which it draws from the doctrinal questions and answers. For the most part it furnishes but the dry bones of Catholic dogma which the painstaking teacher must fill up to make them living, breathing, attractive forms. . . . Of late years wonderful improvements have been made in methods of imparting secular knowledge, in making abstract ideas concrete. Pictures, charts, maps, sand-boards and objects from nature have been called into requisition with splendid results. Is there any reason why the same method should not be employed in teaching catechism; any reason why a class in catechism should be conducted differently from a class in geography, history, or even mathematics? I heartily agree with those who contend that the time has come for us to break away from the traditional way of instructing the young in their religion; the time has come for us to take up again in the class room 'something of the idea that informed the old miracle plays, and with all possible reverence press into the service of religion every appliance that has helped to simplify and make pleasant our secular teaching.'"

These two reverend Superintendents do not stand alone; similar views are expressed on all sides by those who are responsible for the moral training of our children and for the Teaching of Religion in our schools. There is manifested a general dissatisfaction with the prevalent methods and an earnest desire to bring the teaching of religion into harmony with the

[2] Report of Superintendent of the Parish Schools, Archdiocese of Baltimore, 1907, p. 7.

accepted principles of pedagogy. It is believed by many that too much reliance has been placed on the mere memorizing of doctrinal formulae and too little intelligent effort expended in rendering the saving truths of religion functional in the minds and hearts of the pupils. It has also been pointed out that there is a tendency in our schools to isolate the teaching of catechism from all the other subjects in the curriculum and thus the chief reason for the existence of Catholic schools is lost sight of. This phase of the subject was forcibly presented by Dr. Yorke at the Milwaukee meeting of the Catholic Educational Association, in a paper to which reference was made in the January issue of the BULLETIN.

In an article entitled "A Catechetical Movement," in the February number of the *Ecclesiastical Review,* Rev. Francis L. Kerze, of Cleveland, O., presents the two sides of the question. He quotes extensively from Bishop Bellord's *Religious Education and Its Failures* to prove the inadequacy of current catechetical methods. This little work of Bishop Bellord's is doing a good service to our people in bringing home to teachers the need of a radical change in the methods of teaching religion. Here we shall only present one or two passages from this admirable brochure that have an immediate bearing on our present theme.

"Catholic methods of religious instruction have not kept pace with those adopted for secular subjects. Education in religion is carried on in the obsolete, wearisome manner of past centuries." (p. 19.) "Even now many are found who urge that the learning of exact formulas about religion, even if they be quite unintelligible to the learners, is of supreme importance. These words, they say, will remain in the mind steady as a rock through all the storms of life; they will recur to remembrance at length, clothed with the fullness of their meaning, and will become the starting point for a life of faith, devotion and virtue. On such grounds as these there has been founded a perverse cult of the dead letter of the catechism, accompanied sometimes by a total neglect of the spirit which giveth life." (p. 52.) ". . . In substituting *sounds* for *knowledge* and mistaking *words* for *things,* some teachers have gone

almost as far as the Chinese apothecary. If he has run out of a certain drug required for a prescription, he writes its name down and washes off the wet ink into the rest of the mixture; in extreme cases, where no medicine is to be had, the physician makes his patient swallow the written prescription. Our children might just as well have the catechism administered to them in this way through the stomach as through the mere verbal memory." (p. 54.)

Bishop Knecht, of Freiburg, in his article in the *Kirchenlexikon,* is scarcely less severe in his strictures on the verbal methods of teaching catechism. He points out the fact that by these methods the catechist does nothing more than dissect sentences and concepts, and in this way the teaching of religion degenerates into mere exegesis. Such teaching, he insists, cannot sustain the child's interest since it presents only words and formulae which have no content for the child's mind. He further calls attention to the fact that this method is in direct opposition to a fundamental principle of pedagogy which demands that *things* must be presented to the child before *words* and *images* before *concepts.* Bishop Knecht deplores the fact that most catechisms are constructed on analytical principles; they begin with the definitions of particular sacraments which they then proceed to analyze through a series of questions and answers. When the teacher follows the method of these catechisms and explains each sacrament analytically, the children are given an analysis of an analysis which confuses them. We need not wonder, he concludes, that the children dislike catechism and that the results of our religious instruction bear no proportion to the time and labor expended.

The remedy for the condition of things so universally deplored is to be found in the direction of more concrete methods and in closer conformity to the laws governing mental development. Father Kerze, in his article, refers to the advances along this line in Poland and in Germany.

In this country also advances are being made along these same lines. In a series of catechisms published by Dr. Yorke, of San Francisco, there is a decided advance towards better methods. His catechisms are profusely illustrated with splen-

did pictures, only they should be colored. The fact of their not being so is probably wholly due to considerations of the expense involved. Dr. Yorke also gives connected stories instead of the mere verbal dissections. His lessons are likewise accompanied by appropriate hymns. And experience is proving that this series of catechisms is attractive to the children. It is true that much remains to be done in the way of further improvement; the songs should come nearer to the comprehension of the child, and the compromise with the old analytical methods might be abandoned with profit to the children, etc.

That lifeless grind of verbal explanations and memorizing that have constituted the work of the teacher of religion is being replaced by something better, as will be seen from a perusal of the delightful little work entitled, *The Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success,* every page of which is animated with the spirit of the true teacher. Speaking of the mission of the religious teacher, Fr. Sloan says: "We are all unduly inclined to be self-centered in our thoughts and selfish in our desires. The faithful Sunday School teacher, however, soon becomes interested in the pupils of his class. The more he labors with them and the greater sacrifices he makes in their behalf, the more he desires to advance their true welfare, and the greater is the affection for them which fills his heart. He learns to live for others as well as for himself. It is a great and noble thing to so outgrow the boundaries of our own personal interests as to lose self-consciousness in an all-absorbing desire to serve God by promoting humanity's best welfare." [3]

In speaking of the method of teaching catechism by illustration, he says, p. 110-11: "Writers, speakers, and teachers, in fact all who attempt to reveal their thoughts to others, find illustration most useful. Books on rhetoric and oratory give special emphasis to this subject, so also should works on teaching. The Sunday School teacher's aim is to elucidate Christian Doctrine and to make the abstract truths thereof appear before the untrained youthful mind in forms so familiar, so simple and nat-

[3] Sloan, *The Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success,* pp. 7–8, Benziger, New York, 1908, net .75.

ural, that they will be recognized as true, appreciated, revered, and obeyed. To effect this, use of apt illustration is most helpful.

"The use of illustration secures attention. The discussion of abstract truth soon wearies the mind and causes the interest to flag; but no sooner is an illustration of this truth, a figure of speech, an anecdote or story begun than at once the listener is intent to hear its every word. Christ repeatedly used this method of teaching. When the multitude lost interest in His works and grew restless, He addressed them as follows: 'Behold the lilies of the field. They toil not, neither do they spin.' At once the multitude attended, eagerly anxious to know what lesson would be drawn from this comparison. The Sunday School teacher could not do better than to follow Christ in this as in all else."

Here is the direction in which we must look for the solution of our problems—obedience to the laws of the mind as revealed by the study of psychology and as embodied in Our Lord's method of teaching the saving truths of religion. The mere statement of pedagogical principles will have little meaning to the teacher of religion unless he is familiar with the evidence that has been crystallized in the formulation of the principles that he is to obey, or unless he is led to witness the play of these principles in the method employed by some teacher in whom he has implicit confidence or the result of whose teaching carries conviction.

A study of the life and methods of the Great Teacher of the Christian religion should, therefore, form an indispensable part of the training of all who undertake to form the lives of children on the divine model.

Many excellent lives of Christ have been brought out in recent years, but they were written for mature minds and frequently kept matters in the foreground that are of interest chiefly to New Testament scholars. But in 1906 Mother Loyola,[4] of the Bar Convent, York, England, who is already so well and favorably known for her devotional

[4] Mother Mary Loyola, *Jesus of Nazareth* (Benziger, New York, 1906).

writings, brought out a life of Christ especially designed for children. The work is beautifully written and every page of it bears witness to the fact that Mother Loyola knows children and that she is able to meet their needs. The book is edited by Father Thurston, S. J., whose name is sufficient guaranty for the Catholicity and scholarship of the work. But in addition to this we have a Foreword from the pen of Cardinal Gibbons, which, apart from endorsing this book and introducing it to its American readers, deserves the careful study of all who are engaged in the work of teaching religion to little children. He says: "The most efficient way of forming the youthful heart to virtue and piety is to cause the love of God to predominate over the fear of God: 'Be ye followers of God, as most dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness.' (Eph. V. 1.) Again, the Beloved Disciple tells us: 'Everyone that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is charity. Fear is not charity; but perfect charity casteth out fear, because fear hath pain. And he that feareth is not perfected in charity. Let us therefore love God, because God first hath loved us.' (I John, 4.)

"The beautiful life-story of our Blessed Lord, when well told, is a most powerful means of inflaming the hearts of youth with love of God. This love, in turn, will help the children to keep God's commandments: 'And this is charity that we walk according to His commandments.' (II John, 1, 6.)

"My heart was delighted on reading the proof sheets of 'Jesus of Nazareth: The Story of His Life, Written for Children,' by Mother Mary Loyola. The book is eminently practical, simple, unctuous, and interesting. It will make a powerful impression on the minds of the children. In fact, no one can read it without loving God more, and therefore becoming better. The author evidently realizes the wants of the child mind, and, at the same time, comforts every soul in its longing for something higher and better."

The Foreword ends with these words: "Parents, teachers

and instructors will find Mother Loyola's works very useful in the difficult task of forming the minds of children to a life of virtue. We would be glad to see a copy of 'Jesus of Nazareth, Written for Children,' in every household of the land. We wish it God-speed in going out on its great mission."

Father Nolan very justly remarks that the catechism is quite defective in the few moral lessons which it draws. The book before us will supply this defect in large measure. It is much more than a life of Christ. In many respects it is a concrete presentation of Christian Doctrine. Here many grave questions of the most far-reaching consequences for this life and the life to come are presented in the brief compass of a few pages. And yet abstract formulae are avoided. In the first chapter of less than five pages she answers the question "Who art thou, Lord?" She tells of the need of His coming, of the preparation of the world for this greatest of human events, she follows Him through His public career and the children see Him working His miracles and see the eager multitude that gathers around Him to listen to the marvelous truths that drop from His sacred lips. The selection and the training of the apostles, the foundation of the Church, the conversion of St. Paul, and the Divinity of Christ are all presented in this one concrete sketch in such a way as to enter the child's imagination and from thence to pass into his permanent possession. Nor is this chapter an exception.

Chapter II, "On Trial," deals with the question of original sin and its consequences, of the Promise and of the Redemption of the race through Jesus Christ. The presentation is dramatic; the personages are all real, and the bold lines are such as to charm any child, while the truths are presented so as to leave a just impression on the children.

A third chapter of like dimensions concludes the first part of this admirable book. From these three chapters alone the average child will gather a truer knowledge of the sublime truths of the Christian religion than he would obtain from weary months or years of drill in the questions and answers of the ordinary catechism.

The method of presentation here is in entire harmony with

the best pedagogy of the day, and a perusal of the book cannot, therefore, fail to be of incalculable value to all who conduct the work of religious instruction.

* * * * * * * * * *

From Our Teachers.

4. At the beginning of the Christian era the home of culture was in Southern Europe. Why did the nations of the North become dominant?[1]

The history of a given nation and the history of its education are more closely connected than one would be led to suppose at first glance. You cannot cut off the history of the education of any people without doing an irreparable injury to their general history. And on the other hand, had we access only to the history of the struggles and sacrifices, of the attempts and failures, of the strivings and efforts, of the causes and consequences of this education—poor or rich as the case may be—we might easily supply the correlated history of the nation's struggles and sacrifices for freedom, its attempts and failures to reach an ideal, its strivings and efforts for the betterment of the individual and the strengthening of the race, the causes and consequences of its culture and refinement, or the lack of either.

To even the casual student of political history nothing is more striking than the sharp line of demarcation that runs north and south all through the written and unwritten records of man's achievements. From the earliest times down to our own day,—from the dwellers in tents on the plains of Arabia to the last immigrant on our own vast prairies—there is an intangible something that proclaims "East" and "West." We hear of eastern civilization and western civilization; eastern mysticism and western rationalism; eastern passivity and western activity; eastern conservatism and western radicalism;

[1] Pace, *Correspondence Course in The History of Education*, Lesson II. Q. 4.

eastern despotism and western freedom; eastern education with its rigidity of form and content; western education with its elasticity of matter and manner.

This must be. As long as there is a rising and a setting sun there will be an Orient and an Occident. Explain the division as you may—geographical or astronomical—it lies deeper still: it is culture. We can not graft eastern institutions upon western, nor would it be desirable.

This distinction between the races of the earth is patent to everyone. But there is another more subtle yet. As far as the east is from the west, so far is the north from the south. In the former, the difference is one of kind; in the latter, one of degree. By no law of growth from within will eastern civilization flower into western ideals; nor can any law from without weld the two forces into one.

Not so with the northern and the southern. Northern culture is the blossoming of the same plant under changed conditions; different soil and sky and climatic influences. If in the light of present day science these same differences account for physical racial distinctions, why look elsewhere for the causes of the differences in ideals of culture, art, education and religion —or of education alone since in its broadest sense it includes the others?

On account of the three great peninsulas of Southern Europe all the land migrations of its race had to be north or south. The Roman armies carried civilization, military power, law and order across the frontiers into the barbaric tribes of the north—even Christianity followed the Roman eagles; but the northern peoples, having learned their lesson well, returned the visit of the conquerors in their own good time and sent hordes of barbarians to destroy the remnants of that state, once synonymous of all that is great.

Crude as these northern soldiers were—uneducated, uncouth, unformed in all that constitutes culture, they must have imbibed a love for the cloudless blue skies, the snow-covered mountains, the beauty of earth and sea under the soft, sunny atmosphere of the southland, for it is not many generations after until we find their descendants bringing into their northern homes some

of the refinement and grace and culture that were the characteristics of Southern Europe. They succeeded in transplanting the flower of civilization into another soil; but has the blossom been as perfect or the fruit as vigorous?

After all the intervening centuries is culture "at home" in Northern or in Southern Europe? Do the art treasures in the British Museum suggest the dull gray skies of London or the clear blue of an Italian noon-day? Are the Elgin marbles reminiscent of the material progress of England or of the spiritual uplift of Greece? Has the North produced a Phidias, a Praxiteles? Does its cold stone throb with the life and intensity that was chiselled into every piece of Greek and Roman sculpture? Its Thorwaldsen created no new art, but rather interpreted the story of Italian culture. The very museums that house these gifts of the genius of Southern Europe are fair examples of her architecture. To mention the Louvre and the Dresden Gallery connotes not French and German names, but a Murillo and a Raphael.

In what, then, did the nations of the North become dominant—in culture or commercialism? Were they a power in the forum or in the mart? A force in the making or unmaking of States? Their very languages take color from the classic tongues; their highest expression of literature—the drama—is founded upon Greek models, while the plots are often borrowed outright from Greek and Italian sources. A culture thus perpetuated in the speech and writings of the vigorous northern nations cannot die; nor are the Southern races losers in sharing their God-given gift of beauty and culture with their less fortunate neighbors who are willing to rule a world of politics and statecraft, of commerce and trade.

Various factors at work throughout Europe during the ages immediately following the introduction of Christianity aided in bringing about a change in the ideals and culture of the South. The disintegration of the vast empire, the forming of new States, the long military service, the lack of general education—all left their impress upon the fine arts; not only were the creative faculties destroyed for the time being, but Vandal and Goth wiped out nearly every vestige of beauty and culture

that had been handed down from preceding ages. Scarcely had Italy recovered from this disaster when the quasi-religious and military expeditions set out for the Holy Land, using the southern cities as shipping points, returning thither later like Jason with the golden fleece, only to throw open the doors of the seaport towns to commerce.

Even a superficial glance at the history of the city-republic Venice will convince an unprejudiced mind that the ancient stronghold of culture, Southern Europe, was not slow in learning the intricacies of business, commerce, and finance, as the great fortunes of its merchant-princes attest. But this commercialism of Italy—if it may be called such—was used to further the interests of that very culture which had been the heritage of the Roman Empire to the later states of modern Europe. Who today among our men of wealth encourage art for art's sake? Who stand sponsor—not for the spiritual life, but for the common necessaries to sustain existence—for a struggling genius? How many adopt a promising poet or artist? The wealth of Venetian and Florentine merchant was used to buy the wealth of pen and chisel and brush, to educate their people in the fine arts; to encourage talent and genius; to beautify their cities and towns; to make for culture in the truest sense of that much abused term.

Thus a wave of commercialism swept through Italy as a result of the Crusades without, however, destroying its fine sense of the artistic. It bequeathed its trade as well as its culture to the northern nations, but they assimilated the former more quickly than the latter. Perhaps this was not due to their inability to absorb the one, but rather to their natural resources, which furthered the development of the other. The story of the continued prosperity of these races is written in their coal fields and iron mines. Cut off England's coal supply and how long will she continue to be the "Mistress of the Seas?" How long will her factory wheels turn? Exhaust the coal mines of the Rhone valley; how long will France lead the world in the manufacture of silk? If Germany had no coal-beds, how long would she rank second in the textile industries? And without her iron mines who would hear of Essen, made famous by the

Krupp steel works? Truly this is the "Iron Age" and coal is King, nor will his reign end until the white flash of the electric current, generated by the water-power of even the coal-less States, turns the wheels of manufacture and converts a land of silent spindles into trade-centers; and if the propelling force of ship and train could be electric power, how long would commerce lag behind in the march of progress? Under such conditions, Greece and Italy (which cannot boast of a single coal field between them, past nor present) would soon come into their own.

There is still another reason that led to the further development of the northern nations, or rather to their supremacy in world-affairs. While the culture of the South preserved for all time the classics of the pagan world, the literature of the early Church, the lessons of the New Testament; while it sought to perpetuate itself in its arts and crafts, its schools and scholars, its philosophies and universities; while it undertook to preach the Gospel of truth and beauty, it was still hampered in its efforts to carry its message to the whole world—"to every living creature." It felt the limitations of time and space—the spoken word does not carry far; the laboriously penned manuscript must be chained in the library—only a few may learn its precious lesson at a time. While the artistic temperament of the South was lovingly reproducing and illuminating its literature by hand, the utilitarian mind of the North was casting about for some labor-saving machine that would produce the works more perfectly, if less artistically, more rapidly and more widely. This was accomplished by the printing press—the greatest cause of good or bad in the world's history; the chief factor in the education of the masses; the one means that made possible the phenomenal growth of the so-called Reformation; the unlooked for aid in strengthening elementary schools by giving them something more than oral instruction, and in perfecting the professional teaching at the universities by doing away with the memorizing of interminable dictations.

It is not a long step from the printing press to the "Free Press" and its offshoot—the daily paper—which has grown in importance until today when the vast majority of our unthink-

ing population form their opinions and color their judgments by the editorial pages of the morning paper. If, after five hundred years, the power of the printed word is so great, what must it have been in the fifteenth century, which saw the birth of a new world, a new classicism, a new belief!

Along most lines of art, science and education—in other words—of culture, the South has been the forerunner of the North. As far as art is concerned this is generally conceded by public opinion; but somehow even honest persons think that science is an independent product of the North because a scientific mind is a daring mind, whereas one trained in the humanities is apt to proceed slowly and cautiously.

Who had the courage of his convictions and proved his scientific theory about the earth's shape by actually braving the unknown dangers of the unknown deep? Was it not an Italian with a Spanish crew? Was it science or commerce that called a Drake, a Frobisher, a Raleigh to follow after Columbus made known the way? No English or Dutch colonizer circumnavigated the earth before the Portuguese Magellan.

Nor can we pass over the just claims of the Southern races as regards the other sciences. It is sufficient to mention their pioneer work in electricity, their discoveries in pure science, their schools of law and medicine famous the world over.

The women of a country best bespeak its culture. By their status we can gauge the education of heart and mind, body and soul, of its philosphers and thinkers. No nation can be greater, more cultured, more God-fearing, than are the mothers of its lawmakers, of its citizens, of its educators. The woman of Southern Europe, Italy in particular, did not have to wait for her northern sister to "emanicipate" her. She had long enjoyed the same rights as her brother, intellectually and civilly. Not only had she equal rights with him in the universities (and Papal ones, too), but at times she was called to fill the professor's chair! Where in the northern universities have we the counterpart of Maria Agnesi in mathematics, Maria Portia Vignoli in natural science, Matilda Festat in art, Maria Maratti in art and poetry? When an English Shakespeare creates the lovely Portia he naturally gives her an Italian setting.

Evidently the women of Italy were equally at home in Roman law, analytic geometry, or the fine arts, and in the graciousness, culture, and womanly charm that is woman's inalienable right whether she claims North or South, East or West, as her dwelling place.

The Renaissance need not be touched upon to prove that Italy once more lighted the torch of learning and passed it on to the other nations. To her alone was this period a re-birth; to the other lands it was the actual birth of a love for the good and true and beautiful in art and letters. It is true that previous to this, the North had produced—perhaps from having come in contact with the culture of the South—its wonderful Gothic architecture. But even here we can trace the source of its power to co-operation rather than to individual effort. We have great cathedrals, but no one great statue; the great guilds of the Middle Ages, but no one great builder who stands high above his fellows; the exquisite coloring of the massive rose windows, but no painstaking mosaic or original conception finding expression on unfading canvas.

The philosophers, or free-thinkers, of the eighteenth century decried the old order of things and traced all the evils of the times to the Latin races. Their resultant democracies have taken up the cry and would fain make us believe that nothing good can come out of Southern Europe. How can they account for the statistics that show today less general education in democratic America,[1] with its wonderful free school system, than in ancient Athens?

So we may trace the story down through the ages since the beginning of the Christian era and the lesson is ever the same. The South strives for *expression* and the North strives for *repression,* and each calls the result culture. Through the expression of the best things in life is produced individuality, genius, the arts; through the repression of these same gifts may come communism, dominance, the sciences.

[1] Dewey writes: "Hardly one per cent. of the entire school population ever attains to what we call higher education; only five per cent. to the grade of our high school; while much more than half leave on or before the completion of the fifth year of the elementary grade. *School and Society,* p. 42.

If environment counts in education—and all history of the science admits as much—then the races who not only produced the masterpieces of literature, oratory, painting, sculpture and architecture, but whose children were raised in the presence and in the atmosphere of these works which have since held the admiration of a critical world, who learned the right values of the things of life, who drank in the culture of untold ages with the very air they breathed, who understood that "a thing of beauty is a joy forever," still rule the world of science and art, letters and culture! Such a people and such a State have an inheritance that dominates all others to the end of time.

SISTER M. A.

HOLY CROSS ACADEMY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

* * * * * * * * *

2. When should the teacher teach the art of study to his pupils? 3. What means should he use? 4. How will his success in teaching this art affect the discipline of the school? 5. What effect is it likely to have on the character of the pupils? [5]

Of the many arts which may be acquired by the pupils of our schools the art of study is undoubtedly the most valuable and desirable. It is the key to all self-improvement. It creates interest and enthusiasm in one's work. Success in life often depends on it. Above all it is an important factor in the formation of character.

A wise teacher will consider method in study of greater importance than method in teaching, although correct method in teaching can hardly fail to produce correct method in study. In the acquisition of this art by the pupils the teacher acts a very important part. He must be the wise director, the sure guide, the encouraging friend. Some bright, happy pupils might, perhaps, find out this art for themselves, but the majority would not be able to do so, and in consequence would lose great opportunities bearing upon their happiness in after life.

[5] Shields, *Correspondence Course on The Psychology of Education*, Les. II.

The word "study" is derived from the Latin word *studere,* which means to apply one's self with zeal and interest to the acquisition of knowledge or learning. This definition implies more than is generally understood by the term. Hinsdale says: "Study in the proper sense of the term is by no means co-extensive with the zealous pursuit of knowledge." Dr. Bain is of the same opinion: "Study should not be made co-extensive with knowledge-getting, but with book-learning."

This latter application of the term would exclude the study of objects, observation study, oral instruction, the work of the laboratory, etc. In the first years of a child's life, however, no knowledge can be obtained except through one or the other of these channels, while in all the successive grades, high school not excepted, object teaching and object study play a very important part.

I shall, therefore, not restrict the meaning of the word, but understand by the word study the close application of the mind to the acquisition of knowledge and by the "art of study" the practical skill or ability in so applying one's self.

Skill in doing a certain thing is acquired only by a great deal of practice. Skill in study, therefore, is acquired only by the pupil's real doing of it. The pupil will learn to study by studying, as the child learns to walk by walking, to talk by talking. The teacher can direct and assist, but he cannot do the work for him.

When should the "art of study" be taught to the child? I would say begin on the first day when the child enters school. Not, indeed, the real art of book study, for that belongs to a later period, but the child must learn to apply his mind in accordance with the development of his mental energies. It is of great importance for the teacher to study thoroughly the laws of mental growth so as to be able to lay in the child a safe foundation upon which later on to erect an edifice that will be solid and enduring.

The child's mental life previous to his coming to school has not been an inactive one. He has acquired a great deal of knowledge under no tuition but that of nature. His senses have made him familiar with a large number of objects, he has

learned to distinguish their main qualities and characteristics and is able to name them. Sense perception is the predominant mental activity. The child's entering school is not to mark a break in his active mental life. The growth of the mind must be a continuous one. The teacher uses the acquisition of the child as a starting point whence to lead him into regions that are as yet entirely unknown to him. Objects, pictures and stories contain the substance out of which the child's mental food may be prepared. By skillful questioning the teacher will lead the child to analyze, to discriminate, to compare, and to combine the concepts into new wholes, basing his instructions upon the general laws of the mind. 1. The mind at all periods of development naturally grasps or receives the material of knowledge in the form of aggregates, wholes or units, as far as this is possible. 2. In studying, arranging and assimilating the material of knowledge received the mind proceeds first by way of an analysis from wholes to parts. Secondly, it unites the new knowledge with its previous acquisitions, and also, by way of synthesis, the parts and elements which it has found into new wholes, thus rendering its knowledge productive. 3. The mind assimilates, retains and reproduces its acquisitions by the use of certain natural relations called principles or laws of association.

These laws of the mind must guide the teacher in directing the pupil's work, not only in the primary grades, but in all successive ones.

Reading is the great art the child must learn in his first years of school. It is almost coextensive with the art of study, for true reading is study. In this the child has had no previous experience, but the teacher will know how to use the knowledge already possessed by the child and link it to that which it is to acquire. The spoken word or sentence is the bridge to the printed word or sentence. The words or sentences are taught as wholes, then separated into the letters and sounds of which they are composed. The third step combines the elements obtained by analysis to form new words and sentences. The pupil is now able to do some work independent of the teacher. He will learn new words and sentences with very little assistance.

It is the mechanical part of reading he has mastered, but this alone would be of little value to him. The teacher must lead the child to associate the written word or sentence with the thing which it represents and the oral sign with the written one so thoroughly that the one will immediately suggest the other. If the primary teacher has been successful in teaching the pupil to read intelligently, he has taught him how to use the key that unlocks the mysteries of the printed page.

It is now that the real art of book study is to be taught. So far the teacher and pupil have worked together. The pupil's mental energies have been wisely directed and properly stimulated, hence there has been a steady mental growth. His mental activities have been gradually changed. The conceptive and reasoning powers have gained in strength and call for studies suited to their growth. It is of very great importance that the pupil know how to handle the new subjects so as not to waste time, form habits of inattention and listlessness and thereby weaken his mental energies. The teacher must see that the transition be not too abrupt. Oral instruction should precede the study of the lessons at least for sometime until he is convinced that pupils can use the book profitably. Neither too much nor too little help must be given.

Grammar grades are expected to work independently of the teacher, but they also need the wise direction of the teacher. It is especially in these grades that pupils must be taught correct methods of study. The professionally trained teacher here stands out in a clear light. If his method of teaching is correct, based upon sound psychological principles, it will be responded to by correct methods of study in his pupils. The pupils will do no higher grade work than is demanded by the teacher. If the teacher rests satisfied when his pupils have given the correct answer to the problems assigned for their arithmetic lesson without ascertaining how thoroughly they understand the principles underlying the operation, his pupils will invariably work for the answers and will be sure to obtain them by fair or foul means, but the disciplinary value of arithmetic is lost to them. Again, if in geography the teacher demands nothing more than the memorizing of dry facts, lists

of names without anything of interest to associate with them, the location of places on the map without teaching them that they represent realities, so that in the pupil's mind there exists nothing else but the concepts of dots and lines and colored patches of blue and red and green, the pupil may do a great deal of studying, but his method is not correct and his efforts will be more or less misspent. The pupil's method of study is a true reflection of the teacher's method of teaching.

The assignment and the recitation of the lesson are especially the teacher's opportunity to form in his pupils habits of good study. The wise teacher will never dismiss a class, saying, "For your lesson tomorrow study the next two pages." The preparation of the lesson by the pupil depends mainly upon its assignment by the teacher. The teacher will suit the length of the lesson to the capacity of the pupils. Short lessons, but well mastered, are to be preferred to many pages poorly learned. He will state clearly what he demands of them and in what light they are to study the lesson. He will call attention to difficult points and offer suggestions for their solution. He will direct his pupils to use works of reference in order to broaden their views and lead them to exercise their reasoning powers. He will, above all, show so much genuine interest in his pupils' efforts that he will inspire them with love for their work.

The recitation period will reveal to the teacher how closely the pupils have followed his directions. He will discover their weaknesses and defects and apply the proper remedies. This demands great skill and careful study on the part of the teacher. To train his pupils to correct methods of study is the most difficult part of a teacher's work, but it is the ideal towards which every earnest teacher will strive, and his effort in this regard will bear its immediate as well as its remote reward.

The art of study will create in pupils the proper school spirit. Interest, attention, earnest application, confidence in the wise direction of the teacher, and joyful obedience will be characteristics of the school. This school governs itself; it has no need of disciplinary rules.

In training his pupils to correct methods of study the teacher trains them indirectly to correct methods of living. Earnest

study is in itself a powerful means to form character. The mind occupied with useful thoughts is comparatively free from those inordinate and base desires which too often fill the mind of the indolent and the day-dreamer and find expression in wrong doing. The judgment is trained to form correct views. Sound principles will govern the pupil's later conduct and make him a power in the cause of justice and truth. What influence for good are not the various school subjects when studied in the light of Christian faith! What grand moral lessons are not hidden therein! How they bring one nearer to God, the source of all wisdom and knowledge! Study enriches the mind, it ennobles the heart, and renders it susceptible to the beautiful sentiments of religion and virtue.

Let the teacher himself become master of the art of study, let him teach it thoroughly to his pupils, and he will wonder and rejoice at the fruitfulness of his work.

Sister Victoria,
Sister of the Precious Blood.

Mary Help of Christians School,
Maria Stein, Mercer Co., O.

* * * * * * * * *

Query: Do you object to the correction of children's written work by means of blue pencil marking, etc.? If so, please state the remedy.

Sisters of St. Joseph.

Oxnard, California.

There is here involved a principle of wide application in every phase of the work in the schoolroom. It is admittedly one of the teacher's functions to correct the pupil's mistakes, but it is not so clear in what manner this correction may be most successfully made. All Oriental systems of ethics are cast in a negative mold; they bristle with prohibitions. "Thou shalt not, thou shalt not," is written largely in the law of Moses and in the messages of the Prophets, but our Lord reversed this method and yet He did not come to make void the law or to sanction its violation. His method was positive. "Thou shalt

love the Lord thy God" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor." This twofold command summed up the whole law and the Prophets for the followers of Christ. He presented the truth and beauty of the Kingdom over and over again to His followers until at last the divine seed germinated in the minds of some of them and grew and brought forth fruit in due time.

Modern psychology is emphasizing this very truth at the present time; it is showing us that the positive method must dominate in all educational work if we hope for satisfactory results. The negative method may serve to produce time-servers and unintelligent mental automata, but it cannot produce clear, self-reliant thinkers, nor can it produce men with originality and power to wrest from the unknown new provinces of knowledge. Make the child desire to do the right thing and then help him to render his desire fruitful; show him the correct form a dozen times if need be, or "seventy times seven," until he makes it his own.

The teacher should examine the exercises of the pupils in order to discover the deficiencies of his class, but these deficiencies should be corrected not by emphasizing the errors in grammar, in spelling or in rhetoric, but by drilling the class in the correct forms. To emphasize the error by underscoring it in the child's exercise and warning the child not to use the emphasized form shows a lamentable deficiency in the teacher's knowledge of the psychology of mental development. After a little while the prohibitive will be forgotten or become dissociated from the erroneous form which will be thus left in possession.

Young pupils are more likely to be injured by the negative method than are the older pupils; it too often confirms them in their erroneous ways, while it saps the foundations of self-reliance, thus leaving the pupil timid, uncertain and parasitic in his tendencies. But with pupils young or old the negative method should be used, if at all, in a subordinate or subsidiary role.

* * * * * * * * *

Query: Are not many of the rules and definitions, which we memorized as children and which were meaningless to us then, revived at a later date and are they not very useful to us now?

SISTER M. BRIDGET, O. M. C.

That unintelligible formulae memorized in childhood become clothed with their right meaning in after life and thereupon become valuable mental possessions is a belief, or a superstition, which is responsible for many things in our educational methods that seem to me to be radical defects. But if the matter must be dealt with seriously, let me ask any teacher who holds this belief to set down in writing the definitions and formulae which were memorized in this way in childhood and which afterwards proved valuable. When this task is accomplished, take each of these definitions separately and estimate its practical value in adult life, or rather, the value that is derived from the fact of having memorized the formulae in question before it was understood.

Even if the results of this investigation should be positive, it would not thereby prove an adequate solution of our problem. Has the child's memory no other function than the storing of the unintelligible? And if so, are we not depriving the child of the use of one of his most valuable faculties for the time being by cumbering it with a load which is of no present use to the growing mind? If it once be granted that the function of memory is to hold truths that are in process of assimilation and forms of expression that are on the way to becoming automatic, it will be evident that anything which impedes these functions is to be avoided, even if the subject-matter in question would appear to have value later on. When the child's digestive system is only so far developed that it can successfully deal with nothing more complex than milk, is it wise to feed him meat, which it is hoped he may be able to digest some years later?

It is supposed by those who advocate the theory of memorizing the unintelligible that such memorized formulae will aid the mind to gain a truer comprehension of the subject in ques-

tion when the proper stage of mental development shall have been reached, but experience proves that such is not the case. The mind tends to attach some meaning to the memorized definition, and not being able to grasp the real meaning it attaches to it an erroneous concept which proves a great hindrance later on. We frequently find more difficulty in removing these false impressions than in giving the correct view. Anyone who has taught the art of drawing or the art of music, or any other art or craft, will realize what difficulty is encountered in correcting bad habits. There are very few teachers of ability who would not prefer to deal with a pupil who had not been spoiled by indulgence in bad habits. There was a certain Athenian musician who always charged pupils who had taken lessons from any other masters a double fee, on the theory that it was quite as difficult to undo the poor work of other teachers as it was to teach the correct method.

A definition or a rule is a menace to the mental life of all who need it and a blessing to those alone who do not need it. When the pupil has sufficient actual knowledge of a subject to be able to crystallize it in a definition or formulae, a model of such definition will be of value, but not until then.

To sum up, therefore, our contention is: first, that it is wrong to interfere with the normal function of the child's memory by making him memorize definitions and formulae that are not understood by him; second, that such memorized definitions, instead of aiding the pupil at a later period to understand the subject-matter in question, retard such understanding and render it more difficult; third, that by clogging the intelligence with unassimilable matter we cultivate in it a merely receptive attitude and habits of mental parasitism which are unfavorable to initiative and self-reliance.

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Summa Apologetica de Ecclesia Catholica ad Mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis, Auctore J. V. De Groot, O. P. ad Universitatem Amstelodamensem professore. Ed. tertia ab auctore emendata et aucta. G. J. Manz, Ratisbon, 1906. Pp. xvi, 915.

The first edition of this work appeared in 1890. Since then Father De Groot, as he tells us in the preface to the latest edition, has received criticisms and suggestions from men of distinguished merit in the Church and in the intellectual world. Thus aided he has produced a scientific treatise on the Church which undoubtedly will be received with greater favor than the earlier editions. His method is unchanged. With scholastic order and precision he explains in the first question the nature, scope, progress and method of apologetics, and then, in the twenty-three following questions, treats of the Church, the Councils, the Roman Pontiff, Sacred Scripture, Tradition, the Fathers, the Theologians, Reason and History. But he has enriched his work by giving a further exposition of some questions, and by adding new arguments to meet the objections of contemporary opponents of the Church. Frequent citations from recent writers, Catholic and non-Catholic, give evidence of his sound erudition. These, with the references in their proper places, furnish the student with an excellent bibliography. The articles on Inspiration, the Interpretation of Scripture, and the Evolution of Dogmas are worthy of special note. The author has followed the progress made in their discussion, and with great prudence accepts the conclusions proposed by the recognized authorities in such matters. Writing of the affirmations made by the inspired authors he says: "Qui scire desiderat, quid pro certo sacer scriptor affirmare voluerit, ante omnia libri aut loci, de quo agitur, indolem litterariam consideret." We would call especial attention to his chapter on Neo-Apologetica, in which after giving a very clear notion of the doctrine of immanence, explaining the methods of the new apologists, and showing how they attempt to defend Catholic doctrine, he gives an able, though brief, criticism

of the system, showing at the same time its difficulties and shortcomings.

A. L. McMahon, O. P.

Procedure at the Roman Curia: A Concise and Practical Handbook, by the Very Rev. Nicholas Hilling, D. D. Translated and adapted with the author's consent. Pp. 355. New York. Wagner, 1907. $1.75.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Hilling's manual, Die römische Kurie, as it originally appeared in the Seelsorger-Praxis series, will be surprised to see it transformed in this English translation into an imposing octavo. Fortunately this development has not been at the cost of any notable alterations in method or substance,—in fact the translation is so faithful that evidences of adaptation are difficult to detect,—and consequently the praise which the original merited as a clear and practical exposition of the history, constitution and procedure of the Roman court may be bestowed on the English edition. Beyond this, however, few readers will be tempted to go in the way of encomium. The bibliographical sections are poorly done; it is not true that the Studio is a "specific training school for aspirants to episcopal sees" (p. 62). "Contests for rectorship" (p. 64) is a questionable equivalent for our familiar concursus; and the general character of the translator's work is evidenced in such passages as the following,—"multitudes of pilgrims who came to atone for sins of past lives" (p. 127): "The formulary offers good information concerning the extent of the scope of his duties" (p. 127); "as an evidence that the newly established department was not lacking of work, there are still preserved in the archives of the Dataria the large number of 6,690 volumes solely from the pontificates of from Martin V to Pius VII" (p. 123).

Cursus brevis philosophiae, auctore Gustavo Pecsi, Vol. II. Esztergom (Hungary), G. Buzarovits; St. Louis (Mo.), Herder, 1907. 8vo. xii, 319 pp.

The first volume of this text-book was announced in the Bulletin for October, 1907. This second volume contains Cosmology (pp. 164) and Psychology (pp. 165-309). In the first

treatise are presented some interesting points of view and theories. Thus *materia prima* is identified with ether; substantial form, with intra-atomic energy. The laws of the transformation, equivalence and unity of energy are not accepted without restrictions. The law of entropy is true in its negative assertion that movement will come to an end in the world; it is false in its positive assertion that all the energy of the world is preserved as heat. Of the three classical laws of motion formulated by Newton, the first is "ex parte falsa;" the second, "manca!" the third, "simpliciter falsa." The principle of the conservation of energy is "funditus falsum."

In psychology, the author is more conservative. Yet his tendency to simplification is everywhere apparent. In some cases one may doubt whether enough is left for an adequate explanation, e. g. for the formation of the concepts. We call attention to what we consider important omissions. Thus habit is barely mentioned. Too little is said on association, imagination and memory; nothing on the psychological processes of judgment and reasoning, on the whole affective life, on speech, on abnormal states and mental pathology, although the latter have been alleged so frequently against the substantiality and spirituality of the soul.

The main qualities of this volume are clearness and simplicity. The author endeavors to be concrete, and to bring philosophy into contact with science. He eliminates mercilessly as useless or unintelligible some principles which were merely held as an expedient "Deus ex machina." To accept them, he says, "quasi actus fidei requiritur."

The defects are, in many cases, an exaggeration of these qualities. At times we also notice inaccuracies in the presentation of some authors' opinions. Thus Descartes is said to have admitted only one innate idea, that of God. Without more ado, monism is identified in several places with atheism or materialism. To quote one passage: "Et si identicae sunt (the physical and the psychical series) quid eligis, oh Materialista Subtilior? Estne materia potius, vel spiritus? Certe materiam eligis. Et sic cum tota 'subtilitate' tua in materialismum crudum reincidis. Resultatum ergo finale totius theoriae parallel listicæ est o = o." Many monists—all those who incline toward idealism—if allowed to speak for themselves will give a different answer. Moreover, the tone of this passage illustrates the mode in which the author sometimes carries on a discussion. His animus against the Thomists (i. e. Dominicans) as opposed to the Neoscholastics might also be less in evidence.

It seems to us that the student must be guarded not only against skepticism, but also against the other extreme—exaggerated self-confidence leading to conceit and intolerance. Simply presenting the truth will do more in reality than multiplying exclamation marks. Whatever author and theory are worth mentioning and discussing in a text-book must be worth mentioning and discussing without sarcasm.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Psychology. By Charles Hubbard Judd, Ph. D., professor of psychology and director of the psychological laboratory at Yale University. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907. 8vo. Vol I, General Introduction. Pp. xii, 389. Vol. II, *Laboratory Manual.* Pp. xii, 127.

To indicate the main features of this work we can do no better than quote the author's words in his preface: "This book aims to develop a functional view of mental life. . . . In the second place, I have aimed to adopt the genetic method of treatment. . . . In the third place, I have attempted to give to the physiological conditions of mental life a more conspicuous place than has been given by recent writers of general text-books on psychology. . . . In the fourth place, I have aimed to make as clear as possible the significance of ideation as a unique and final stage of evolution."

Professor Judd abandons the commonly accepted classifications of mental processes into cognitive, affective and conative, or into cognitive and active. His principle of classification is: "We shall hold once more to the objective conditions of consciousness and shall accept as a distinct group of facts any which are differently conditioned and, at the same time, different in their subjective characteristics and relations." This principle leads to the following sequence of chapters. After an introduction, two chapters on the nervous system, and one on the general analysis of consciousness, we find the study of sensations (V), their functional relations, i. e. perception (VI), the reaction to sensory impressions, and mental attitudes assumed in response to experiences, viz., experience and expression (VII), instinct and habit (VIII). All the forms of consciousness mentioned so far are related directly to sensory impressions; passing now to those that are supplied indirectly through memory, we have memory and ideas (IX), language (X),

imagination and the formation of concepts (XI), especially of the concept of the self (XII), impulse and voluntary choice (XIII), and forms of dissociation (XIV). The last chapter is on the applications of psychology.

The exposé is very clear, but, if intended as a textbook, the work will probably be found a little too technical for the beginner, although this can be remedied to a large extent by explanations from the professor. References to psychological literature are entirely omitted.

Without trespassing on the domain of metaphysics, the author shows that psychology leads to higher problems: "It continues, when rightly understood, not only to contribute material for philosophic thought, but also to urge the student to the rational reconstruction of his general abstract views." Nor does he sympathize with "the curious tendency in much modern thought to deny any primary reality to the self."

The second volume of the series gives suggestions and directions for psychological experiments to be performed in connection with the study of the various mental processes. A third volume is announced giving a complete description of the apparatus and methods of procedure necessary to carry out these experiments.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Gli ultimi capi del Tetramorfo e la Critica Razionalistica cioè l'Armonia dei quattro Evangeli nei racconti della Risurrezione, delle Apparizioni e dell' Ascensione di N. S. Gesù Cristo. By Adolfo Cellini. Roma. F. Pustet, 1906. Pp. xiv+319.

After a brief preface in which he calls attention to the importance of the Resurrection in Christian Propedeutics, Cellini devotes a rather lengthy, but interesting introduction to an exposition of the various Biblical schools among Catholics. The main points of difference bear on the idea of Biblical inerrancy, and thus we have the traditional school, the progressive (Batiffol, Lagrange, etc.) and the radical (Loisy, etc.) This last one Cellini rejects as anti-Catholic; he shows a marked leaning to the progressive school for the Old Testament, but is far more reserved when it is a question of the New.

The main work is divided into three sections as is indicated in the title. They deal respectively with the narratives of the Resurrection (pp. 33-182) the Apparitions (pp. 183-232) and the Ascension (pp. 235-319). Each section is accompanied by an appendix. We cannot follow the author in all the details of his work; the perusal of it has been for us a source of great interest. In general, the exposition is clear and systematic; there is in this volume enough information to make its study highly profitable. The author has closely followed Bishop Le Camus and Vigouroux in most of his explanations. As representative of the Rationalist school, Cellini has selected Strauss. This is rather surprising, for although Strauss' views did not all die with him, still they have been developed and occasionally modified by subsequent authors. A defence of the Resurrection should have been directed preferably against modern writers, such as v. g. Schmiedel to Meyer, whose existence Cellini does not seem to know.

In his harmonizing the various apparent antilogies of the narratives, Cellini has neglected too much the questions of general introduction to the Gospels; the conclusion which we may hold on each Gospel as a whole, may greatly affect our views with regard to some special details.

Again, in our opinion, Cellini has not taken into account sufficiently the consistency even in details of each evangelical narrative, when taken by itself. This is not one of the least difficulties brought forward by modern Rationalists. To give but one example. Matthew seems to be perfectly consistent with himself, in arranging his narrative so as to lead to the apparitions in Galilee. If we had only Matthew we would not find, it is claimed, even a a hint to show that he was conscious of omitting apparitions in Jerusalem; these he does not seem to have known at all or at least admitted. In the same way, Luke is thoroughly consistent in placing the apparitions in Judæa; he gives no sign of his knowing or at least admitting the apparitions in Galilee. He gives no hint to show that the Apostles had ever left Judæa when they received the order to remain in Jerusalem. No harmony of these details in the two evangelical narratives is complete without taking the whole context into consideration. For this reason, we think that Articles II and III of Section II are not entirely satisfactory. That the antilogies can be harmonized, we have no doubt, but we believe that this aspect of the problem should not be overlooked.

The principal merit of Cellini's work, and one which is not to

be despised, is to have shown that one who has admitted the claims of the Christian religion to be divinely revealed need not change his convictions, on account of these antilogies, but he has added comparatively little to what we possessed already concerning the historical reality of the Resurrection as a *positive* criterion of Revelation.

R. BUTIN.

Il Messianismo secondo la Bibbia. Discorsi d'Avvento e studi critici. By Dott. Prof. Emiliano Pasteris. Roma: F. Pustet, 1907. Pp. xvii, 248.

The above work is made up of four conferences delivered first at Turin and again at Vercelli, in 1903 and 1904. Each conference is followed by notes, theological, philosophical, exegetical, historical, etc., in which the author discusses more in detail some of the points touched upon in the conference proper. An analysis of these discourses will give an idea of their worth. The first conference,—Jesus the Judge, or Last Advent—treats of the resurrection, the characters of the last judgment, the final catastrophe, and the New Heaven and New Earth. The second—Jesus the Messias, or Middle advent, a Testimony of Jesus,—establishes the claims of Jesus to the Messiaship, by considering the answer of Jesus to the disciples of John, in which he vindicates his claims by appealing to his miracles and to his doctrine. The third is a continuation of the preceding theme, and explains the testimony of John the Baptist to the Messiaship of Jesus. The fourth and last,—Jesus Foretold or First Advent—is a summing up of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, Pentateuch, Sapiential books, Psalms, and Prophets proper.

The reader will find grouped together most of the Biblical texts which bear on the various questions treated. There is in this work a spirit of Christian earnestness which will certainly appeal to all the priests called upon to deliver such conferences.

R. BUTIN.

Tales of Troy and Greece. By Andrew Lang. New York and London, Longmans, 1907. Pp. ix, 302.

These charming tales, delightfully retold in simple language, will be read with pleasure, not only by children, but also by adult ad-

mirers of the Homeric stories. The incidents are narrated in the direct, unreflective manner of the ancient epic; details, however, as in the matter of costume, utensils, weapons, etc., are filled in from the information supplied by the most recent archeological discoveries. The illustrations by H. J. Ford are on a level with the artistic standard set by the author.

The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries. By James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph.D., LL. D., Acting Dean and Professor of the History of Medicine, etc., Fordham University School of Medicine. New York, Catholic Summer School Press, 1907. Pp. xvii, 436.

"The object of the book," the author informs us, "is to interpret, in terms that will be readily intelligible to this generation, the life and concerns of the people of a century (the thirteenth) who, to the author's mind, have done more for human progress than those of any like period in human history." This is a comprehensive claim, as the author himself concedes. That he has established his claim, however, will be admitted by the fairminded reader who follows him through his study of the manysided activity of the men and women of the thirteenth century and examines with him their works, their institutions, their poetry and romance, their artistic achievements, their libraries, their schools, their guilds, their hospitals, their explorations and discourses, their commerce. Dr. Walsh knows his century well, and writes about it with the enthusiasm of one who loves it. His chapter on Popular Education by means of the Arts and that on Democracy and Christian Schools are especially worthy of praise. Indeed, there are many things in this book which will be a revelation to those who, taking up the refrain of the Renaissance denunciation, and repeating without sufficient reflection the superficial verdict of the *Illuminati,* look upon the thirteenth as a century barren of all seed of progress. A study of the philosophy of that century ought to lead one to suspect what this book proves, that the Renaissance itself, so far as it had any elements of progress, drew largely from the age that preceded it, and that the illumination of the eighteenth century owes more to the age of Scholasticism than it ever suspected. We hope that Dr. Walsh's book will meet with the success which it so richly deserves and we congratulate the author who has added this to his many notable successes in his chosen field of constructive historical

apologetic. The Catholic Summer School Press also deserves a word of commendation for the excellent make-up of the text and the superior quality of the illustrations.

The American Revolution, Part III. By the Rt. Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Bart. Longmans, Green & Co., London, Bombay, Calcutta, 1907. Pp. 492, index and maps.

In the BULLETIN for April, 1904, parts I and II of this comprehensive history were reviewed with much care and at considerable length. That examination noticed the somewhat inadequate treatment of the important era preceding the war for American independence. It is scarcely necessary to say that that criticism does not apply to this installment of the work, which begins with a recapitulation of the Trenton and Princeton campaigns and comprises a narrative of events, military and political, down to February, 1778, the date of the fortunate alliance with France. In all probability one more volume of equal extent will bring the reader to Yorktown, though even two would not be unwelcome.

Concerning the present section of this history little need be said. It is marked by all the characteristics of the preceding volumes; the more important of these have already been noticed. Students of American history who know the details of every campaign and every siege and have at their finger-tips the achievements of every captain will find in it very much that is familiar. Indeed, their favorite hero may be absent from his accustomed place, and some deed of note may be passed without observation, but for such omission there is abundant recompense in the author's admirable summary of the situation in England and the conditions on the continent.

In the beginning are ably discussed such topics as the war governors, Congress, the State Legislatures and the dearth of military stores. A few brief paragraphs place before the reader the essential facts of the Paoli "massacre," and a single chapter summarizes European public opinion. In this section is outlined the services of Choiseul in reorganizing after the Seven-Years' War, the military and naval power of France, the reforms of Turgot, the ambition of Vergennes and the enterprise of Beaumarchais. There is likewise added a very clear account of the attitude of Frederick the Great and a perfectly logical explanation of his motives in urging France to commit herself to the American war. In the minds of

many citizens of the United States there exists much vagueness as to the precise nature of the services rendered by the King of Prussia.

By no means an unimportant part of this volume is its account of the Congressional attempts to deal with foreign affairs. In this part is included a very just estimate of the value of Franklin's public services. The limitations of Congressional committees in the field of diplomacy might have suggested to the author a section treating of their grasp of public finance. This subject will doubtless be discussed in a succeeding chapter. The high standard adopted in the earlier volumes is in every respect maintained in the present section. It is to seriously to be hoped that nothing will prevent the author from completing his great work.

C. H. McCarthy.

Ailey Moore. By Richard Baptist O'Brien, D. D., Dean of Limerick. Fr. Pustet & Co., Ratisbon, Rome, New York and Cincinnati, 1907. Price $1.00.

This is a reprint of a work that some half century ago attained considerable celebrity in Ireland. It gives a vivid picture of the operation of the Irish land laws about the middle of the nineteenth century and of the horrors of the famine of 1849. Incidentally it makes us acquainted with things so widely separated in thought as obsession by evil spirits, trial by jury, and secret societies in Italy at the beginning of the Pontificate of Pio Nono. It is in its way a powerful story. It lacks art, however, inasmuch as the good characters are made absolutely immaculate and the bad ones are sketched in colors too black to be realistic, while the lesson it conveys—for it is a novel with a purpose—is rather obtruded on the notice of the reader by formal argumentation on the part of the author than worked into the fibre of the story. Even with these defects it will repay perusal by any one seeking a knowledge of an unhappy condition of affairs that is now fortunately a thing of the past in Ireland.

Marginal Notes by Lord Macaulay, selected and arranged by Sir George Otto Trevelyan. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, London, Bombay and Calcutta, 1907. Price, .50 net.

This is an interesting study in an interesting by-path of literature. Macaulay's notes on "a silly author" like Miss Seward, on the

portrait of Richard Bentley, on Theocritus, on Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* and *Catiline*, on Swift, on Gibbon, on Conyers Middleton, on Shakespeare, on Warburton, on Cicero, on Plato, and on Socrates are all characteristic. The selection has been very well made.

Good-Night Stories told to very Little Ones. By Mother M. Salome. Burns & Oates, London, Benziger Bros., New York Chicago, Cincinnati. Price, .75 net.

This profusely and quaintly illustrated little volume of stories for children should be in the hands of every young mother in the land. It would be of advantage to the mother as well as to the bairns. "Forehead" and "Angels" are specially good.

Honour Without Renown. By Mrs. Innes-Browne. Burns & Oates, London, Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1906. Price, $1.25 net.

A charming story. There is enough of plot to keep the reader's interest sustained throughout, and the whole-hearted devotion of Sister Marguerite is beautifully depicted. This book cannot fail to interest and edify any one who reads it.

Madame Rose Lummis. By Delia Gleeson. Burns & Oates, London, Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1907.

This biography of a wonder-worker of our own days shows what true zeal for souls can accomplish, despite excruciating bodily suffering and numerous material and other difficulties. Madame Lummis appears to have had the real Apostolic spirit.

Apologia pro Vita Sua, being a History of his Religious Opinions. By John Henry Cardinal Newman. Pocket Edition. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Bombay and Calcutta, 1907.

This is an admirable reprint of one of Newman's most characteristic works. It is very well turned out. The binding is handsome and the typography remarkably clear.

BOOK NOTICES.

In the February number of the BULLETIN, page 209, in Dr. Butin's review of Tillman's DER MENSCHENSOHN (Freiburg, Herder, 1907), a typographical error occurs, which makes Dr. Butin seem to countenance Dr. Tillmann's severe criticism of Father Rose's *Etude sur les Evangiles*, whereas in fact the reviewer meant quite the contrary. In place of *justified* (line 7 from end of page) read *unjustified*.

The house of Herder (Freiburg and St. Louis) is rendering a notable service to the cause of theological literature by its reprint of the classical works of Catholic ascetic theology (BIBLIOTHECA ASCETICA MYSTICA), edited by the well-known Jesuit scholar, Father Lehmkuhl, and the first volume of which, the "MEMORIALE VITAE SACERDOTALIS" of Claude Arvisenet, we noticed in the BULLETIN for 1907 (XIII, 304). We have now to chronicle the publication of several of the ascetic master-pieces of Blosius, his "Canon Vitae Spiritualis," "Piarum Precularum Cimelarchion," "Tabella Spiritualis," "Speculum Spirituale," and "Monile Spirituale." The volume is entitled "MANUALE VITAE SPIRITUALIS CONTINENS LUDOVICI BLOSII OPERA SPIRITUALIA SELECTA" (Herder, Freiburg, 1907) and deserves a place in the library of spiritual works that every ecclesiastic is continually adding to.

Many persons will welcome the little work of D. J. Scannell O'Neill, DISTINGUISHED CONVERTS TO ROME IN AMERICA (St. Louis, B. Herder, one dollar). It is an alphabetical list of 3,000 names, from the most distinguished walks in life. It is significant that of the 372 Protestant clergymen to enter the Catholic Church in the United States, 142 became priests, 4 of whom reached the episcopal dignity, while of the female converts 260 became nuns. It would have been well to give more frequently the approximate date of conversion in each case, also the relative figures of men and women. No doubt this American edition of "Rome's Four Hundred" will soon appear in a new and revised edition, on which occasion various improvements might be added. The compiler deserves and will reap gratitude for a task that was not accomplished without considerable difficulty.

We recommend to our readers the very handy little "HANDBOOK OF CEREMONIES FOR PRIESTS AND SEMINARIES," translated from the German of Fr. J. B. Muller, by Andrew P. Ganss, S. J., edited by W. H. W. Fanning, S. J. (B. Herder, St. Louis, 1907, one dollar).

It is doubtless a labor of love that the gifted editor of the *Boston Pilot*, Miss Katherine E. Conway, has accomplished in the tasty volume entitled, "IN THE FOOTPRINTS OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD, 1857-1907" (New York,

Convent of the Good Shepherd, East Ninetieth street, 1907). Fifty years of the purest and sincerest devotion to the reformation of the weak and the protection of the imperilled members of the female sex are a theme that might well tempt one of the modern historians of the sociological school. In the meantime we are permitted to enjoy the very readable and full description (taken from the convent's domestic annals, supplemented by the writer's personal observation) of the five decades during which these Sisters have labored in the great metropolis. We can all agree with Miss Conway's closing words. "Many changes are before us, but of one thing we may be sure; no matter how great our social and scientific progress, the sad old fashions of sin and sorrow and death will not pass away while time endures. And while they last there will be work for the Nuns of the Good Shepherd."

The Christian code of happiness, its divine origin, its possibility, equity, and sweetness, are well set forth by Mgr. Henry Bolo in his work entitled "THE BEATITUDES: THE POOR IN SPIRIT, THE MEEK AND HUMBLE" (translated from the French by Madame Cecilia, Benziger, New York, 1906.) It is a pity that so useful a commentary on Christian "felicity" should be without an index, all the more necessary because of the aphoristic style of the learned and pious writer.

The life of the first bishop of Manchester (New Hampshire) is the story of a laborious and saintly priest whose elevation to the episcopate simply enlarged his opportunities for self-sacrifice in the quality of a pioneer Catholic bishop amid surroundings that were always far from encouraging ("THE LIFE OF DENIS M. BRADLEY, FIRST BISHOP OF MANCHESTER," by M. H. D., Guidon Pub. Co., *ibid.*, 1906). Yet he held on his way with great faith and abundant charity and left to his successors and his people the ever efficient encouragement of a saintly memory. It is at all times eminently proper to preserve some record of men of such simple religious uprightness and thoroughness; they constitute the brightest pages of the domestic annals of our American Catholic life, while at the same time they reveal to the entire Church a vision of ordinary sacerdotal perfection that enthuses and uplifts.

Every ecclesiastic can read with pleasure and profit the small brochure of Rev. Patrick Boyle, C. M., entitled A HOMILY OF SAINT GREGORY THE GREAT ON THE PASTORAL OFFICE (New York, Benziger, 1907). It adds a useful supplement to the well-known English translation of the "Regula Pastoralis of St. Gregory" by H. R. Bramley (London, 1874); in this connection we may mention another work of Fr. Boyle, his valuable English translation of St. John Chrysostom's classic treatise "On the Priesthood" published a few years ago (Gill, Dublin; Benziger, New York).

The old and meritorious publishing house of Victor Lecoffre (J. Gabalda et Cie, 90 Rue Bonaparte, Paris) continues its excellent series of "LES SAINTS," most of which have been already described in the BULLETIN.

Among the latest volumes are Saint Martin (316-397) by Adolphe Regnier (1907); Sainte Hélène (about 248-328), by A. M. Rouillon (1908); Sainte Eloi (590-659), by Paul Parsy (1907); Saint Pierre Damien (1007-1072), by Dom Reginald Biron, O. S. B. (1908); Sainte Mélanie (383-439), by Georges Goyau (1908), and Les Martyrs de Gorcum (1572), by Hubert Mueffels, C. M. (1908). These volumes are all commendable for their brevity, good order and proportion, select bibliography, moderate and critical temper—above all for their habitually excellent literary quality and correctness of form. Without depreciating the other volumes, it may be said at once that the Sainte Mélanie of M. Goyau is a little "bijou" of historical exposition and right Catholic feeling that will be highly appreciated by all who have not time or occasion to read the larger and more costly "Santa Melania" of Cardinal Rampolla.

Among the lives of Jesus Christ that we have read none appeals to us for its good method like the work of the Abbé Verdunoy published by the Lecoffre house (L'Evangile: Synopse, Vie de Nostre Seigneur, J. Gabalda et Cie, Paris, 90 Rue Bonaparte. 1907). It presents at once those facts which are narrated by all the evangelists, weaves them into a continuous life, and deals briefly with the principal difficulties. The work is especially useful to the parochial clergy, whether as material for sermons, or a little encyclopedia of answers and explanations, or a book of spiritual reading. A useful introduction (pp. 1-33) gives an outline of the gospels in general (nature, inspiration, formation), manuscripts, translations, brief notes on the character of each gospel, especially of the synoptic gospels. A large map of Palestine and smaller maps of the City and the Temple of Jerusalem add to the value of the work, which is in every way a desirable one, and is based on the best and latest Catholic researches (Jacquier, Lepin, Rose, Calmes, Lesêtre, etc.)

In the thirty odd years of its existence the Institut Catholique of Paris has rendered notable services to the cause of French Catholicism, particularly by the formation of a corps of learned ecclesiastics who have shed no little lustre on their fatherland. One of the most promising of its students, the Abbé Gustave Morel, was suddenly taken off (1905, by drowning) during a brief vacation in Russia. He had just been called to teach Patrology and Positive Theology, after an excellent training in the Institut, and a period of special preparation in Germany (Tübingen, Würzburg) and two journeys to England in consequence of which, and his close relations with M. Portal of the "Revue Anglo-Romaine," he took a deep interest in the question of Anglican Reunion. Withal, he was a priest of pronounced piety and spiritual earnestness, and gave the greatest hopes to his Alma Mater. His friend the Abbé J. Calvet has written a pleasing sketch of the young and brilliant professor too soon snatched away by the hand of death (L'Abbe Gustave Morel, Paris, Librairie des Saints Pères, 1907, pp. 336).

We owe to the piety and gratitude of Mr. Percy Fitzgerald, F. S. A., the distinguished author of "Fifty Years of Catholic Life and Social Progress" (London, 1901), a brief sketch of the famous Jesuit orator FATHER GALLWEY (London, Burns and Oates, 1906) together with a number of interesting letters written to the author in the early fifties while he was yet under the guidance of this distinguished Stonyhurst teacher, and revealing, with a fine literary taste and a delicate flavor of classicism, the personal authority which a beloved master can wield over a grateful pupil, even when the latter has entered on his own independent career.

Many of our readers are doubtless already acquainted with the new and luminous exposition of the ancient controversy concerning the personal orthodoxy of Pope Honorius published in the *Dublin Review* (1907), by Dom John Chapman under the caption CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS. It is now reprinted by the English Catholic Truth Society (69 Southwark Bridge Road, London, S. E., 32mo., pp. 116, threepence).

It was a happy idea to compile from the Latin Vulgate a First Latin Book for schools (DELECTA BIBLICA, compiled from the Vulgate Edition of the Old Testament, and arranged for the use of beginners in Latin, by a Sister of Notre Dame, London, Longmans, 1907, 8o, pp. 79). In this way the Christian child faces but one difficulty, that of the language, the matter or content being already familiar from its religious training. The fifty-six brief chapters seem well chosen; a preface, introduction, and vocabulary contribute to the usefulness of the little class-book. Perhaps it would add to the value of this Christian Latin Reader if a brief description of the Latin Vulgate were inserted, its origin, character of its latinity, religious and literary influence, etc.

The Roman house of Fr. Pustet (Piazza San Luigi, Rome) has undertaken the publication of a series of apologetic brochures under the general title of "FEDE E SCIENZA," now in its fifth series, and embracing some fifty subjects. Though not so old, and, therefore not so rich, a collection as that of "Science et Religion" (Bloud et Barral, 4 Rue Madame, Paris), it is called to render great service to the reconciliation of Christian Faith and Modern Science. Among the latest numbers likely to interest our readers we may call attention to the brochure (1905) of the late Cardinal Cavagnis on Free Masonry (La Massoneria, quel che é, quel che ha fatto, quello che vuole); a study (1906) of the Biblical Canon by Professor Francesco Mari (Il Canone Biblico e gli Apocrifi); a little treatise (1906) on the Discourse of Christ at the Last Supper (Il Discorso Eschatologica di Gesù), and a brief sketch (1907) by Giulio Salvadori of the youth of Frederic Ozanam (La Giovinezza di A. F. Ozanam). Each series (ten booklets) forms a volume; the brochures are sold for about 20 cents each. The (foreign) subscription to each series or volume is 8 lire ($1.60).

Among the valuable curios of modern theological literature is the defence of the Catholic doctrine concerning St. Peter by Rev. Paul James Francis,

S. A., and Rev. Spencer Jones, M. A. The former is editor of "The Lamp" (Graymour, Garrison, N. Y.), a periodical "destined especially to the cause of Corporate Reunion with the Apostolic See," while the latter is president of the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury, author of "England and the Holy See," etc. Their work is entitled, "THE PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES; A STUDY," and deserves praise for the fullness and point of its scriptural and historical defence of the primacy of St. Peter. We recommend to our readers the two chapters (pp. 135-166) on the "Witness of the British Church" and the "Pre-Reformation Witness of the Ecclesia Anglicana." They are a "catena" of genuine historical evidence, irresistible to an honest and open mind; the latter chapter in particular amply bears out the thesis of the writers (p. 156) viz, that "no intelligent student will be found to maintain in our day that England was anything but what we now term a Roman Catholic country from A. D. 1066 to 1534." This is substantially the thesis of Frederick Maitland, the great Anglican historian of mediæval law, in his "Roman Canon Law in the Church of England." These earnest writers deserve more than praise; they deserve, with all sympathy, our prayers that they may not wait too long for an improbable turning of a tide whose headway, according to the best signs, is in the wrong direction.

Constant and earnest repetition of the great fundamental truths of religion is at all times necessary in order to offset the equally persistent propaganda of all the irreligious forces of our time. Among these truths none are at present the subject of more opposition than the existence of God, the soul, another life; the necessity of religion; the claims of Christianity and the truth of the Catholic religion. These subjects are treated, briefly but pointedly, by M. Lepin in his little brochure "POURQUOI L'ON DOIT ETRE CHRETIEN (G. Beauchesne et Cie, Paris, 1907, pp. 61, 50 centimes). Fr. Lepin is a Sulpician priest, and author of other excellent works, among them "Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu" and "L'Origine du quatrième évangile," the latter already noticed in the BULLETIN (XIII, 281).

Thomas à Kempis, in his own way, has so influenced all succeeding centuries of Christian life that we need not wonder that his "COMPLETE WORKS" in English translation have found a hearty welcome, even in our un-mystical age. The fifth volume, containing his "Sermons to the Novices Regular" is now offered to the public (B. Herder, St. Louis, 1907, 8o. pp. 255), translated from the critical edition of Dr. M. J. Pohl by Dom Vincent Scully, C. R. L., author of a "Life of the Venerable Thomas à Kempis." An introduction describes briefly the novitiate at Windesheim, to whose members these elevating discourses were preached; incidentally their entire authenticity, doubted to some extent by Kettlewell, is defended by Dom Scully (p. XXVI) who says that in the University Library at Louvain he was "privileged to see and handle the autograph volume of à Kempis that contains the sermons."

THE EDITOR.

BOOKS RECEIVED.[1]

History and Biography.

A Short History of The Oxford Movement. By Sir Samuel Hall, M. A., K. C. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. 1906. Pp. 267.

The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages. By Rev. Horace K. Mann. Volumes II and III. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder. 1906. Price, $3.00 each.

The Decrees of the Vatican. By Rev. Vincent McNabb, O. P. New York, Benziger. 1907. Pp. 47.

St. Brigid. By Rev. J. A. Knowles, O. S. A. New York, Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 292. Price, $1.25.

An Elementary History of England. By E. Wyatt-Davies. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. 1906. Pp. xv, 256.

History of Ireland. By Rev. E. A. D'Alton, M. R. I. A. New York, Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. xv, 568.

Lord Acton and His Circle. By Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. 1906. Pp. xxxviii, 372. Price, $4.50.

The Condemnation of Pope Honorius. By Dom John Chapman, O. S. B. London, S. E., Catholic Truth Society. 1907. Pp. 116.

The King Over the Water. By A. Shield and A. Lang. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. 1907. Pp. 500. Price, $4.20.

Rambles in Eireen. By Wm. Bulfin. New York, Benziger. 1907. Pp. xi, 450. Price, $2.25.

Philosophy and Education.

Les idées de Philon d'Alexandrie. By M. Bréhier. Paris, Picard. 1908. Price, francs 7.50.

The Three Ages of Progress. By Julius E. Devos. Milwaukee, Wis., M. H. Wiltzius Co. 1906. Pp. xv. 387, xxi.

The Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success. By Rev. Pat-

[1] Books received from publishers or authors will be placed on this list, with imprint *and price, when marked.* In this way, each work will be promptly brought to the attention of our readers. In many cases, a lengthy notice will be given in a subsequent number of the Bulletin.

rick J. Sloan. New York, Benziger. 1908. Pp. 187. Price, 75 cents.

Devotional Works.

The Degrees of the Spiritual Life. By Abbé A. Saudreau. New York, Benziger. 1907. Pp. xi, 331; x, 306. Price, $3.50. 2 Volumes.

The History of the Passion of Our Lord Jesus. By Rev. James Groenings. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder. 1908. Pp. xv, 461. Price, $1.25.

In The School of St. Francis. By Imelda Chambers. New York, Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 107. Price, 40 cents.

Sodality Manual. By a Jesuit Father. New York, Fr. Pustet & Co. 1907. Pp. 156. Price, 25 cents.

Liturgy.

Handbook of Ceremonies. By John Baptist Müller, S. J. St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder. 1907. Pp. xvi, 256.

Miscellaneous.

Sheer Pluck and Other Stories of the Bright Age. By Rev. David Bearne, S. J. New York, Benziger Bros. Pp. 180. Price, 85 cents.

Faithful and True. By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. New York, Benziger Bros. Pp. 36. Price, 30 cents.

A Pilgrim From Ireland. By Rev. Maurice Carnot, O. S. B. New York. 1908. Pp. 132.

The Boys of Baltimore. By A. A. B. Stavert. New York, Benziger Bros. 1908. Pp. 212. Price, 85 cents.

The Dyed Garments From Bosra. By S. M. P. New York, Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 92. Price, 30 cents.

My Lady Beatrice. By Francis Cooke. New York, Benziger Bros. 1908. Pp. 244. Price, $1.25.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

The following is the text of the Pontifical Letter in which the Holy Father, appointing Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B., to the presidency of the Committee on the revision of the text of the Vulgate, makes appeal to Catholics throughout the Christian world for co-operation and assistance in this great undertaking. The examination of all the extant codices of the Vulgate and their collation is a gigantic task, to the successful accomplishment of which the goodwill of the custodians of manuscripts, generous financial aid from wealthy Catholics, and the organization, direction and guidance of a whole host of collaborateurs are absolutely necessary. We hope that Abbot Gasquet will meet with a hearty response from Catholics, who have in the past been so unjustly accused of indifference towards the preservation and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures.

Dilecto Filio Aidano Gasquet, Abbati, Congregationis Anglo-Benedictinae Praesidi

PIUS PP. X.

Dilecte Fili, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Delatum Sodalibus Benedictinis munus pervestigationum studiorumque apparandorum, quibus nova innitatur editio Conversionis Latinae Scripturarum, quae Vulgatae nomen invenit, adeo equidem arbitramur nobile ut gratulari vehemeter non tibi modo, sed sodalibus universis tuis, iis maxime qui adiutores clari operis erunt, debeamus. Operosum et arduum habetis propositum facinus, in quo sollerter, memoriâ patrum, celebres eruditione viri, ipsoque e Pontificum numero aliquot, felici haud plane conatu, elaboraverunt. Adjungentibus vobis rei illustri animum, non est dubitationi locus, finem vos concrediti muneris fore assecuturos, qui finis restitutione continetur primiformis textus Hieronymianae Bibliorum Conversionis, consequentium saeculorum vitio non paullum depravati. Explorata, qua Benedictini Sodales pollent, palaeographiae historicarumque disciplinarum scientia, eorumque compertissima in pervestigando constantia, certo securoque animo doctos esse jubent

perfecta vos investigatione antiquos Codices universos Latinae Scripturarum Interpretationis, quotquot adservari in Europae Bibliothecis ad haec tempora constat, esse examinaturos; idque praeterea habituros curae, Codices ubique conquirere in lucemque proferre, qui usque adhuc incomperti lateant. Has vero conquisitiones valde est exoptandum ut, quo minore fieri negotio possit, persequi cuique vestrum fas sit; ideoque praefectis tabulariorum bibliothecarumque studia vestra impensa commendamus, nihil ambigentes, quin pro sua in doctrinas Librosque sacros voluntate, omnem vobis gratiam impertiant.—Singularis praestantia rei et concepta de vobis ab Ecclesia expectatio; ingenium item horum temporum, quibus illud certe dandum est laudi, pervestigationes istius modi ita perficere, ut nulla ex parte reprehendendae videantur; talia haec profecto sunt, ut aperte inde appareat, oportere id opus ad absolutionem plane ac perfectionem afferri, ductuque confici normarum, quae plurimi apud disciplinas id genus aestimentur. Equidem intelligimus longo vobis opus esse temporis spatio, ut munus exitu fausto concludatis: talis namque agitur res quam animis aggredi et perficere necesse est curarum et festinationis expertibus. Neque vero perspicuum minus Nobis est, quam multa pecuniae vi tam amplo exequendo consilio sit opus: ob eamque rem spem libet amplecti non defuturos immortali operi qui de suis fortunis adjutores velint se dare, bene de Sacris Litteris ac de Christiana Religione merituri. Eos Nos, perinde atque vos, initio egregii facinoris, hortatione prosequimur, velint Nobiscum adiumentum operi afferre; quandoquidem qui bona impendunt studia, liberalibus debent manibus fulciri. Auspicem luminum gratiarumque coelestium, indicemque praecipuae dilectionis Nostrae Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi iisque universis ac singulis, qui studium opemve praestantissimo facinori contulerint, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die III Decembris anno MCMVII, Pontificatus Nostri quinto.

PIUS PP. X.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Senate Resolutions on the Death of Dr. Stafford.—The following resolutions were passed at the February meeting of the University Senate:

Whereas, it has pleased Divine Providence to remove from among us the Reverend Doctor Denis Joseph Stafford, late Pastor of Saint Patrick's Church in our city, and

Whereas, from the earliest days of the Catholic University Doctor Stafford was always a true friend, and ardently sympathized with the purpose and works of the University, and

Whereas, he gave practical expression to his friendship and sympathy by the large collection which he annually obtained from his generous and devoted people, and by bequeathing to the University his valuable library, and

Whereas, in his church and his home he extended always a warm welcome to our directors, professors and students:

Be it Resolved, that the University mourns the loss of its true friend whose zeal for religion, devotion to his pastoral office, intelligent and ardent patriotism, no less than his singular eloquence in the pulpit and on the platform, made him rightly distinguished both as a priest and a citizen; that it extends a sincere sympathy to the relatives of Doctor Stafford, the parishioners of Saint Patrick's Church, the people of Washington, and the archdiocese of Baltimore; also that these resolutions be spread on the records of the Senate, and be published in the next number of the *Catholic University Bulletin.*

Annual Meeting of the Alumni Association. The Annual Meeting of the Alumni Association of the Catholic University of America will be held at Boston on May 12th.

Celebration of the Feast of St. Paul. On January 25th, the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, the patronal feast of the Faculty of Theology, was celebrated in the Chapel of Caldwell Hall. The Celebrant at the Solemn High Mass was Very Rev. Dr. Creagh,

Dean of the Faculty of Theology. The preacher of the occasion was Rev. F. A. O'Brien, LL. D., of Kalamazoo, Mich., whose instructive sermon on the priesthood laid professors and students under an obligation of gratitude to the learned and eloquent speaker.

Death of Mgr. Mackay. In Monsignor John M. Mackay, of Cincinnati, Ohio., the University lost a friend and benefactor. To the Diocese of Cincinnati, especially to the Archdiocesan Seminary, and to the relatives of the late prelate, the Rector, Professors and students of the University extend their condolences. Monsignor Mackay will be commemorated among the benefactors of the University as the founder of a Burse for the benefit of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.